SOLD BY

THE SEQUEL TO CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND, 1781-1803. With numerous Portraits and other Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 25s. net.

THE EVE OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION, being the History of the English Catholics during the first Thirty Years of the Nineteenth Century. With Portraits and other Illustrations. 3 vols. 8vo.

Vols. I. and II. 1803-1820. 21s. net.

Vol. III. 1820-1829. 12s. 6d. net.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF BISHOP CHALLONER (1691-1781). By EDWIN H. BURTON, D.D., Vice-President of St. Edmund's College, Ware. With 34 Portraits and other Illustrations. 2 vols. 8vo, 25s. net.

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS.

Emery Walker Ph. sc.

Right Rev. Peter Augustine Baines
Bishop of Siga
Vicar Apostolic of the Western District 1829-1843
From a painting by James Ramsay formerly at Prior Park
now at Downside Abbey

THE SEQUEL TO CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

THE STORY OF THE ENGLISH CATHOLICS CONTINUED DOWN TO THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF THEIR HIERARCHY IN 1850

BY THE RIGHT REV.

MONSIGNOR BERNARD WARD, F.R.HIST.S.

CORRESPONDING MEMBER OF THE SOCIÉTÉ ARCHÉOLOGIQUE DE FRANCE
PRESIDENT OF ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE
AUTHOR OF "THE DAWN OF THE CATHOLIC REVIVAL IN ENGLAND (1781-1803)"
AND "THE EVE OF CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION (1803-1829)"

IN TWO VOLUMES

VOL. I.

1830-1840

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS



LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1915

3417

Nihil Obstat.

F. Thomas Bergh, O.S.B.,
Censor Deputatus.

Imprimatur.

Edmundus Surmont, D.D.,
Vicarius Generalis.

Westmonasterii, *die* 9 *Julii*, 1914.

TO

THE CONVERTS TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

IN ENGLAND

WHOSE ZEAL FOR THE ANCIENT FAITH

NO LESS THAN THAT OF THE HEREDITARY CATHOLICS, WHO NEVER

LOST IT, OR THAT OF THE SONS OF ST. PATRICK

WHO CAME IN THE DAY OF THEIR OWN MISFORTUNE TO STRENGTHEN

AND EXPAND IT, BINDS THEM TO OUR COMMON MOTHER

IN ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF WHAT HE OWES HIMSELF

TO THE DEVOTION AND SELF-SACRIFICE OF OUR CONVERTS,

THESE CLOSING VOLUMES AS A GRATEFUL TRIBUTE ARE RESPECTFULLY

INSCRIBED BY THE AUTHOR.

PREFACE.

It was in the year 1906 that the Bishop of Clifton invited me to his house to see the collection of letters and papers which he had lately discovered bound up in some thirty large volumes, relating to the days of the later Vicars Apostolic from 1780 onwards ;[1] and he was kind enough to press me to study them and to write on the period which they covered. At first it seemed impossible to spare sufficient time to undertake so large a work with any hope of doing it satisfactorily. As, however, he urged his request, eventually, though with much diffidence, I consented to try the first period. Gradually the work developed ; it has already grown into five volumes, and now to two more. Whatever measure of usefulness may have resulted therefore is attributable in the first instance to the Bishop of Clifton's initiative.

At the same time it would not have been possible to write of the period with any completeness, but for the uniform encouragement received from all quarters, and the freedom with which those in whose keeping are the various letters and papers which survive from those times have permitted free access to them, and given every facility and encouragement to the work. This is the suitable opportunity to express my appreciation of their confidence and kindness, and to hope that in return I have at least endeavoured that any point of view to which particular papers may refer should be fairly and

[1] All the letters and papers before that date were destroyed when Bishop Walmesley's house at Bath was burnt by the Gordon Rioters in that year.

sympathetically presented, irrespective of whether it agreed with my own views or whether it did not.

In the Preface to the *Dawn of the Catholic Revival in England* the following words occur :—

"It seems generally recognised that the times of the later Vicars Apostolic are shrouded in some obscurity. It was accordingly determined to begin the present work with the years which followed the death of Bishop Challoner in 1781, and to continue it if possible down to the time of the Hierarchy. It is much to be hoped that if this proves beyond the power of the present writer, some one else may be found to complete the undertaking."

This passage indicates the extent of the work as a whole, as it originally appeared to the mind of the writer. In view of the uncertainties of life, one could hardly look forward with any confidence to being spared to finish so considerable an undertaking ; and hence the qualifying sentence at the end. It is therefore with the greater satisfaction that now in the year 1915 the work as set out at the beginning is complete, for the present volumes bring us down to the restoration of the Hierarchy.[1] And although it has been done in less time than could have been expected—for it has proceeded almost at the rate of a volume a year—it is hoped that the period has been fairly covered, without any important omission ; and whatever the shortcomings, at least every movement and event of importance has been faced. This has necessitated the revival of the recollection of many disputes and misunderstandings between laymen and their Bishops, and even among the Bishops themselves, which had been almost forgotten ; but if the lessons of

[1] It should perhaps be mentioned that a great part of this book had already been printed off in 1914 and it would have appeared in that year but for the outbreak of the war. It was thus impossible to correct all the allusions to current events throughout, so that, for example, Pius X. is spoken of as the reigning Pontiff. It has been thought better therefore to leave it in the form in which it went to press.

history are to be learnt, it is necessary that we should be willing to face such matters, provided that sufficient time has elapsed to prevent the recital from being the source of a revival of party feelings now happily long extinct. Milner expressed his opinion that thirty years ought to elapse before the history of those turbulent times could be dispassionately written. In point of fact nearly three times that period has elapsed since the struggles were at an end.

The period covered by the present volumes is—with the possible exception of the incidents of Chapters II. and III.—practically free from the acute struggles described in the preceding ones. There are indeed misunderstandings and differences of opinion to chronicle—and wherever human nature exists there will most assuredly always be such ; but they did not reach the acute pitch characteristic of the times of Milner, Charles Plowden, Dr. Poynter, and the Catholic Committee. It is believed, however, that the interest of the present period will be found in no way inferior to that of the earlier ones. As we get nearer to modern times, the personal side of the history becomes more vivid, and lends variety. Among the laity the vigorous and characteristic personalities of men such as Welby Pugin and Frederick Lucas, the saintly figure of the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, and his convert friend Mr. Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, added to occasional glimpses of O'Connell in his relations with English Catholics ; among the ecclesiastical rulers, Bishop Baines, Bishop Wiseman, and latterly Bishop Ullathorne, together with the two Roman Cardinals, Weld and Acton ; among the inferior clergy such scholars as Lingard, Tierney, and Daniel Rock, added to the picturesque figures of the three great missionaries—Father Dominic, Dr. Gentili, and Father Ignatius Spencer—bring before us names which recall an interesting and eventful period of our ecclesiastical history. The lives of most of these great men have

indeed been written; but it is hardly an exaggeration to say that down to 1845—the year of the Oxford conversions—the period as a whole has been almost as forgotten as the years which preceded Emancipation.

After 1845 there is literature in abundance, and if one had simply consulted the convenience of writing, it would have seemed well to leave off there, or at least at the death of Dr. Griffiths, Vicar Apostolic of the London District, in 1847; for as will be seen, this latter event really marked the passing of the old order of things. It seemed necessary, however, for the sake of completeness to continue the story through the three years' delay, due chiefly to the Revolution in Rome, and take it down to the actual establishment of the Hierarchy, as originally proposed.

Nevertheless, this course was not without its grave drawbacks, for it has involved telling once more, however briefly, the story of the Oxford Movement, which has been written and re-written so copiously and from such various points of view that many will hardly welcome its repetition, with little that is new to embellish it. The only fresh contribution to the general story in the present volumes is the view of it as taken by the "old Catholics"—as they were styled—a view typified by Dr. Griffiths's letter in answer to Prince Höhenlohe, and by various articles and letters in the *Orthodox Journal* or *Catholic Magazine*, which are not altogether without interest.

Another incidental drawback connected with the same subject is that the careers of the Oxford converts as Catholics really belong to the next period—to Wiseman's Archiepiscopate. If we consider that very few of them joined the Church before the year 1845, that those who became priests had then to go through such training as was thought necessary by whatever Order they joined, or by their Bishops, as the case might be, before Ordination, it is evident that the bulk of their

work as Catholics would be after 1850. But in some cases—as in those of Newman and Faber—it was begun a year or two before that date, so that it becomes necessary to introduce the reader to the beginnings of various undertakings of which the development must be looked for elsewhere. In the case of Henry Edward Manning this difficulty does not arise, as he did not become a Catholic until 1851.[1]

It will be seen that throughout these two volumes the central figure is Dr. Wiseman. Although his life has been written very fully, a fair amount of supplementary matter will be found in the present volumes concerning his connection with the work of the "old Catholics".[2] He necessarily appears in a somewhat different light in cold history from that which he assumes at the hands of a biographer with whom he is the central figure throughout. His limitations and his occasional mistakes become more prominent; but this is no disadvantage in helping us to arrive at a full estimate of his life and work, and it is believed that the net result will be by no means to lessen the idea which has been formed of him.

It is perhaps natural that Wiseman's very greatness has caused him to be credited with some of the works of his predecessors to which he can lay no claim. His achievements have put those who were before him somewhat in the shade, and the work done by them has in some cases become credited to him. For when Wiseman came to live in England it was a time of considerable development in all Catholic work. In particular, the modern congregations such as the Sisters of Mercy,

[1] It may be well to note that as the present work is written primarily for Catholics, such titles as "the Church," the epithet "Catholic," or "Protestant," or the like are used in the sense accepted amongst ourselves; in the few instances in which they are applied to those of the Anglican communion, they are put in inverted commas, unless the context makes the sense clear.

[2] As a special instance may be mentioned Chapter XXVI., which is almost wholly new matter.

the Faithful Companions, the Religious of the *Sacré Cœur* and others were opening houses in London and elsewhere. Dr. Wiseman was in full sympathy with this movement, and especially after he came permanently to London in 1847, did much to foster and develop it. But he was not the originator of it, as is so often thought. Nor was his predecessor Dr. Griffiths an unbending opponent of the churches of Regulars, as is so frequently stated.[1] And it was not due to Wiseman that the Redemptorists for lack of subjects refused the invitation to come to London in 1844, and afterwards, having secured more members, came in 1848. It may indeed be conceded that Dr. Griffiths took a somewhat narrow view of the functions of the Regulars, in comparison with the parochial (Secular) clergy ; and that Wiseman's largeness of heart and great ideas did more to encourage their coming than the calm prudence of his predecessor ; but there was no such definite antithesis in their respective policies or mode of government of the diocese as has been usually implied.

Furthermore, it has often been said, and indeed is commonly asserted, that Wiseman brought the Roman spirit to England. This necessarily implies that before his time the Roman spirit was wanting among English Catholics. In a sense this is undoubtedly true. The long isolation due to the Penal Laws had produced a certain narrowness of outlook in the Catholic body, and a dry and formal style of prayer, both of which stand out in contrast with the breadth and warmth of devotion characteristic of the Apostolic See. Looking back, no one will now question what we owe to Wiseman for beginning to break down this insularity, and helping to found many devotions which have developed since his time so as to remove from us any such reproach.

In essential matters, however, and questions of doctrine, many would vehemently deny that there was

[1] See, for example, *Life of Faber*, p. 364.

any want of the truest Roman spirit among the Catholics of that day. It was perhaps natural that a body to whom the traditions of the Catholic Committee and the Cisalpine Club were supposed to cling should be suspected of Gallicanism—a suspicion which Manning and others in later years treated almost as an axiom. Yet I venture to think that, so far at least as the laity were concerned, the accusation was wholly devoid of foundation. The Cisalpinism which was openly professed by them at the end of the eighteenth century was political rather than theological, and was aimed directly at helping on the question of Emancipation. And even when at its worst, it was limited to a few. Charles Butler himself declares[1] that the extreme men such as Sir John Throckmorton—who called upon the Catholics to elect their own Bishops without having recourse to Rome—never had any following, and whatever Cisalpinism existed in the lay leaders quickly died down as soon as the political situation changed—which was quite early in the nineteenth century. Unfortunately the name "Cisalpine Club" continued for many years, and was a continual reminder of the past; but Dr. Poynter bore witness in 1815 that even at that date the club had long ceased to have any theological tendency whatever, and its title was only an empty name. This statement is fully borne out by a perusal of the minute book, which shows that after the first few years the club became nothing more than a social gathering. Had it contained any anti-Roman spirit, O'Connell would assuredly never have wished to join it in 1829.

We can also quote the written authority of Father Amherst. Speaking of the later members of the Cisalpine Club, whom he himself remembered, one of whom was his own father, he says that "it would not be too much to say that in remembering them [we] call to mind

[1] In his unpublished memorandum about the Jesuits. See *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, iii., p. 23, note.

men who were remarkable for their respect for Church authority, and who carefully instilled that respect into the hearts and minds of their sons". The present writer can add at least some corroboration by bearing witness that of the very many letters of the Catholic laity on ecclesiastical matters which have passed through his hands written during the period under review in these volumes, he does not call to mind a single sentence which, so far as obedience and devotion to the Holy See is concerned, might not have been written by the most extreme Ultramontane. The spirit always breathes of accepting and acting on not only the decisions of the Holy Father, but also any expression of his wish.

It is possible that some traces of Gallicanism could be found among the clergy of those days, which may have been due to traditions imbibed when the Colleges were in France; but it is probable that it was imputable to individuals rather than to a class. No more typical English Catholic priest could be quoted than Dr. Gradwell, who learnt his theology at Crook Hall, the precursor of Ushaw; and when he went to live in Rome, as Rector of the English College, he does not appear to have found himself in any way out of sympathy with the theological opinions in vogue there and taught to his own students. In similar way it may be pointed out that Dr. Cox, who for eleven years presided over St. Edmund's College, had been one of Dr. Wiseman's students and had learnt his theology in Rome; and we do not hear that he found any tendency in the theological teaching at Old Hall to which he took exception. Many would indeed maintain that on such subjects as Papal authority and the like the views expressed in authoritative quarters to-day would accord more with the careful and balanced exposition of them characteristic of the English clergy of the old school than with the

more rhetorical method of speech used by the zealous converts of a generation later.

Once more I have the pleasant task of thanking those who have given continual encouragement and assistance to the work. The Cardinal Archbishop has continued to give me every facility for consulting the valuable archives at Westminster, and has in many ways shown a practical interest in the progress of the work. The other diocesan archives have likewise been placed at my disposal by the Archbishop of Birmingham and the Bishops of Clifton, Southwark, and Leeds—the latter of whom has recently discovered the valuable collection, formerly belonging to Bishop William Gibson, of the existence of which he was hitherto unaware. At the Colleges also of Oscott and Ushaw, and the English College at Rome, every facility has been given for the use of their archives. Some interesting letters have also been used from those belonging to Bishop Ullathorne, now in possession of his former secretary, Rev. Joseph Parker. Both the Jesuits and the Benedictines have assisted me in the same manner as before. And I would add a special word of thanks to Mrs. Francis Pollen, who has lent me some original papers and letters referring to her grandfather, Mr. Thomas Chisholm Anstey, including a short biography written by his daughter, now a Benedictine nun of Stanbrook.

Unfortunately at Rome the rules for the consultation of the various collections have become more strict, and the freedom formerly accorded to me of looking through the volumes at Propaganda was not repeated. Permission was indeed given to see any particular document asked for; but in many cases it is obvious that the existence of the papers relating to a subject is not known until they are met with in the course of a general examination, and it is only by permitting free access that the cause of historical research can be served. It is hoped, however, that in the present case the loss has

not been a serious one, as nearly all the official letters to and from Rome have been kept, either the originals or copies, in the various episcopal *archivia* in England. In the references no further details are given beyond the collection from which the document is taken. This is mentioned because it has been the subject of comment on the part of some reviewers of the previous volumes. But in the majority of cases, there has been no option in the matter; for in most of the collections alluded to no final arrangement has yet been made, beyond a general one in order of date.[1] Hence a document is easily found if its date be given, but there is no other means of specifying it. In one or two instances, such as that of the Downside papers, where by the industry of Dom Norbert Birt, O.S.B., every piece has been lettered and numbered, a further specification would no doubt be an advantage, and it was chiefly for the sake of uniformity that it was not given.

My best thanks are due as before to Abbot Bergh, O.S.B., for kindly acting as censor, and for various suggestions and information, especially about the latter part of the period, which comes within his early recollections; and to Rev. Edwin Burton, Rev. Albert Purdie, and other friends for helping with the proofs and in other ways.

St. Edmund's College,
August, 1915.

[1] At Clifton the papers have since been re-bound under the supervision of the Bishop, and every piece has now a number affixed to it.

CONTENTS OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	vii
I.	AFTER EMANCIPATION	1
II.	BISHOP BAINES AND THE BENEDICTINES: FOUNDATION OF PRIOR PARK	15
III.	BISHOP BAINES AND THE BENEDICTINES (*continued*)	34
IV.	EARLY AGITATION FOR A HIERARCHY	50
V.	DR. WISEMAN'S VISIT TO ENGLAND (1835-36)	65
VI.	AUGUSTUS WELBY PUGIN	82
VII.	PUGIN'S EARLY WORK	101
VIII.	EPISCOPAL NEGOTIATIONS	122
IX.	MISUNDERSTANDINGS WITH ROME	135
X.	CREATION OF EIGHT VICARIATES	154
XI.	APOLOGIA FOR THE VICARS APOSTOLIC	168
XII.	PRAYERS FOR THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND	203
	APPENDIX TO VOLUME I.	221
	CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE	281
	INDEX	287

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS IN THE FIRST VOLUME.

RIGHT REV. PETER AUGUSTINE BAINES, Bishop of Siga, Co-adjutor, 1823; Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, 1829-43 . . . . . *Frontispiece*

From a painting by James Ramsay, formerly at Prior Park, now at Downside Abbey.

FACING PAGE

RIGHT REV. JAMES YORKE BRAMSTON, Bishop of Usula, Co-adjutor, 1823; Vicar Apostolic of the London District, 1827-36 (*ætat c.* 70) 12

From a painting at St. Edmund's College.

MAP OF THE ENGLISH MISSION, placed before Propaganda by Bishop Baines in 1829, to support his Petition for the Re-arrangement of the "Districts" 26

The original is among the Clifton Archives.

PRIOR PARK, SHOWING THE PROJECTED CHURCH, WHICH WAS NEVER BUILT 30

From a water-colour painting in possession of the Bishop of Clifton.

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL WELD 43

From a painting at the English College, Rome.

RIGHT REV. THOMAS GRIFFITHS, Bishop of Olena, Coadjutor, 1833; Vicar Apostolic of the London District, 1836-47 . 54

From an engraving in the Catholic Directory for 1848; *the original picture is at Archbishop's House, Westminster.*

HENRY BAGSHAWE, Q.C. 67

From a painting in possession of his daughter, Mrs. Latter.

FACING PAGE

MEDAL PRESENTED TO DR. WISEMAN BY THE CATHOLICS OF LONDON IN MEMORY OF HIS VISIT, 1835-36 . . . 74

AUGUSTUS WELBY NORTHMORE PUGIN. 82

From a painting by an unknown artist in the National Portrait Gallery.

EXAMPLE OF PUGIN'S "CONTRASTS"—CONTRASTED ROYAL CHAPELS 90

RIGHT HON. JOHN TALBOT, SIXTEENTH EARL OF SHREWSBURY 104

From a print at Oscott College.

ST. MARY'S, DERBY 114

Reproduced from the Catholic Magazine *for September*, 1839.

RIGHT REV. JOHN BRIGGS, Bishop of Trachis, Coadjutor, 1833; Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District, 1836-40; of the Yorkshire District, 1840-50; Bishop of Beverley, 1850-60 122

From a positive on glass, of the early days of photography, at St. Wilfrid's College, Oakamoor.

REV. ALOYSIUS GENTILI, LL.D., Inst.Ch. 138

From a painting at Ratcliffe College, Leicester.

HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL ACTON 154

From a painting at the English College, Rome.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, OSCOTT 174

An early print, preserved at Oscott, showing the first Corpus Christi procession at the new College in 1838.

THE HON. CHARLES LANGDALE 197

From a water-colour sketch at Houghton Hall, by kind permission of Lord Mowbray and Stourton.

AMBROSE LISLE PHILLIPPS (AFTERWARDS PHILLIPPS DE LISLE) 204

From a painting in possession of his grand-daughter, Mrs. Mayne.

REV. GEORGE IGNATIUS SPENCER (AFTERWARDS FATHER IGNATIUS, C.P.) 214

From a painting at St. Joseph's Retreat, Highgate.

THE SEQUEL TO CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION

CHAPTER I.

AFTER EMANCIPATION.

ONE result of the passing of the Emancipation Act in 1829 was to dissolve the bond of union which had held the English and Irish Catholics politically together. The inevitable debate in the two Houses of Parliament which people had begun to regard as an annual fixture ceased, and the Catholics of the two nationalities each went their own way—and very different ways they were, for the circumstances of the two countries were widely different.

In Ireland, the bulk of the nation had been civilly emancipated by the Act, and it remained for them now to profit by the new aspect of life which opened out before them. In this respect much depended on the spirit in which the new Act would be administered. With respect to the election of Catholic Members of Parliament, the matter rested with the people themselves. If they were true to their own principles, and voted in accordance with their wishes and interest, the number of Catholic members would at once be considerable, and would gradually increase as fresh seats which had been held by friends of the Catholics became vacant, so that they could be filled by actual Catholics; and notwithstanding the disfranchisement of the poorer freeholders, on the whole we find this to have been the case.

But with respect to their holding offices, civil or municipal, for which they had now become qualified, it appeared that they had yet to win fair play. Though forming the great majority, they were still kept as much as possible out of the national life. We may quote no less an authority than Marquis Wellesley, who was intimately acquainted with Irish

political and civil life. "In 1833," he writes,[1]—"four years after Emancipation,—there was not in Ireland a single Catholic judge or stipendiary magistrate. All the high sheriffs, the overwhelming majority of the unpaid magistrates and of the grand-jurors, the five inspectors-general, and the thirty-two sub-inspectors were Protestants. The chief towns were in the hands of the most intensely bigoted Corporations. For many years promotion had been steadily withheld from those who advocated Catholic Emancipation, and the majority of the people thus found their bitterest enemies in the foremost places." Those who had flattered themselves that Catholic Emancipation would put an end to all agitation soon found their mistake, and the Marquis of Anglesey, when he became Lord Lieutenant for the second time, changed his former policy, and resorted once more to repressive measures.

But in truth there was no possibility of contentment even after Emancipation so long as the State Church of the few, and those of a different race, had to be supported by the many who were nearly all Catholics. The tithe war which raged at this time was only one sign of the impossibility of procuring real contentment in Ireland so long as the bulk of the population continued to suffer on account of their religion.

The case of English Catholics was quite different. Forming as they did a very small body, they did not look for political power. Their seven Peers sat henceforward in the House of Lords, and for a while the influence of the chief landowners secured the election of a certain number of members of the House of Commons; but with the advent of the Reform Act the number of English Catholic members was reduced eventually almost to vanishing-point. Some of the influential Catholics took their turns in serving as sheriffs of their counties; but not many did even this. The elder ones among their number had been so trained to a life of retirement that they had little ambition to come out into public life. They rejoiced to have seen the day of Catholic Emancipation and sang their *Nunc dimittis* as though to prepare for death, with the consolation which that thought gave to them. It had come too late to affect their own careers; but they rejoiced to think that better times were opening out in front of their descendants and successors.

[1] *Life*, iii., p. 406.

There is something pathetic in a recital, such as the following, of the outline of the life of a Catholic gentleman, typical of those days. In reading it, we must bear in mind that the writer, Mr. Howard of Corby—who died in 1842—belonged to one of the first families of the land, at a time when rank and influence were ordinarily supreme; but they both counted for nothing in the face of the fact that he was a Catholic. Towards the end of his life he wrote the following note on his own career:—[1]

"We were all obliged before 1778 to seek for education abroad, and consequently seldom saw home or parents for six or eight years. The army being my choice, I did not see either for more than three days during ten years. I was sent to the Teresian Academy at Vienna; but neither my father, his relatives, nor the kind endeavours of that excellent gentleman Sir Robert Murray Keith, our ambassador, under whose eye I had been for four years, could obtain leave for me to serve in our army: I even in 1779 offered to serve as a volunteer in America, but did not receive any encouragement. . . . In 1783 the late Duke of Norfolk tried to obtain for me admission into the German part of the military establishment of his Royal Highness the Duke of York. At last I had to give up my favourite object: thus the best part of my life had passed away in unavailing attempts; and when later I endeavoured through the kind offices of Sir George Howard to procure a commission for a very fine young man, my brother, I found it still inadmissible. In the hope of more favourable times, he entered into the Sardinian service; but there, in a small village in Piedmont, was carried off by a fever, without having a single Englishman near him. . . . A seat in Parliament in my neighbourhood was offered to me in a very flattering manner, with other advantages, which the law forced me reluctantly to decline. Like other Catholic gentlemen, when the laws respecting us began to be relaxed in their execution, I served in the militia, went to Ireland, and afterwards, by the friendship of many distinguished men in this country, who placed themselves under my command, I formed a volunteer corps (the Cumberland Rangers), and we served till peace broke us up. Such *par force*"—he ends—"has been my inefficient life."

[1] See the *Catholic Magazine*, April, 1842, p. 252.

The younger men among the Catholic body, however, entered on the new period in the spirit of hopefulness, especially those whose school days were just ending, and who were preparing to enter into life. Father Amherst tells us of the thoughts which filled the minds of himself and his brother as they left Oscott in 1838, and looked forward to the future.

"The elder of the two," he writes,[1] "observed to the younger that he could not conceive a grander position for a young man than that in which the Catholic youth of England then stood. The fact is that the young men of that time were the first-fruits of the season of Emancipation. They had gone to school about the time when the great Act was passing through Parliament; they had no personal experience of the times when their elders were living deprived of the liberties of British subjects. They had of course heard a great deal about the Penal Laws and the dark days and the hard times through which their forefathers had passed. Their grandfathers had lived in the deep gloom of the night, but had been spared to see at least the advancing dawn; their fathers had witnessed the aurora breaking into daylight; but the young men themselves had lived only under the risen sun. . . . Certainly the effect which the events of those days produced upon thousands of Catholics in England was like the effect of the first fine days of Spring after a long and dreary winter. . . . There was a large number of Catholic young men then in England who would not have been content to incur the reproach that they did not know how to use the victory which their parents had gained."

Yet it must not be supposed that the course of a Catholic through life had become an easy one. The feeling against "Papists" was too strongly engrained in the minds of the nation to be eradicated at once by an Act of Parliament. The fight against prejudice was long and laborious. Nor did they compete at all on equal terms with their Protestant neighbours. The isolation of their education, the fact that they knew nothing of the English public schools or the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge made them at once a class apart, and the habits of aloofness which their fathers had contracted could not but affect their homes and their traditions of life. Some

[1] *History of Catholic Emancipation*, p. 1.

little time elapsed before Catholics were to be found occupying high positions and taking part in public life.

Looking back, however, we feel no reason to be ashamed of the work of our co-religionists of the Emancipation period. Men such as the sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, or Charles Langdale, or Edward Petre, or Charles Weld, or Hon. Charles H. (afterwards Lord) Clifford who had their careers before them when the Act was passed, were persons of sterling virtue and merit, and their careers were worthy of the best traditions of the English Catholic body.

In addition to the direct effect of Emancipation on Catholics must be added the indirect effect on those outside the Church, who from that time treated Catholics with greater respect, and showed more inclination to listen to their arguments. The result was a considerable influx of converts among the upper classes of society. There had indeed long been a steady flow of conversions among the middle and poorer classes in the towns; but hitherto educated persons had with a few exceptions held aloof. This was now changed, and the number of conversions had a sensible effect on the tone of the Catholic body, causing an inevitable friction with the hereditary Catholics which grew as the number of converts increased. There is nothing surprising in this: the wonder would be rather that two such dissimilar bodies settled down together at all. The extreme exclusiveness of the Catholic aristocracy, already alluded to, caused an initial barrier of reserve which had in the first instance to be overcome. Their retiring manner and entire absence of ostentation was often mistaken for a want of education, at least greater in degree than there was any foundation for;[1] while curiously enough on the other side the old Catholics themselves often accused the converts of covering a want of education by an affected manner of speaking. Then again, the old Catholics never reflected on matters of controversy, from the very fact of the peace and security which they felt in their life-long views and beliefs; while in the case of their

[1] This appearance of want of education was emphasised by the prevalent custom among Catholics of not sounding the letter H—a custom which was probably due in the first instance to their foreign education. The Rev. John Holdstock frequently wrote his own name as "Oldstock," and every one pronounced it as if so written.

devotions, their one idea was to go on in the beaten track, and to be unseen by the outer world. Naturally the feelings of a convert were the reverse of all this. In view of the complete upheaval of his religious convictions which had necessarily preceded his entry into the Church his mind was filled with the arguments for the step he had taken and schemes for bringing these home to others. He looked on the hereditary Catholic as wanting in zeal for, and even interest in his religion. That a man could make his morning meditation, hear daily mass, give himself to spiritual reading and the like, as a matter of course, and never reflect on the nature or excellence of those practices was unintelligible to him. He longed for the more demonstrative style of devotion which he had looked forward to, and was ready to arouse the supposed apathy of the old Catholics by founding associations or gilds or confraternities, and setting on foot works for the conversion of those whom he had left behind him in the Anglican communion.

At the present day, when converts and old Catholics have long learned to appreciate each other, we do not easily realise the troubles incidental to their early relations with one another. It probably worked in the long run to the mutual advantage of both classes. The first fervour, and often indiscreet zeal of the convert was all the better for the damping influence of the apparent apathy with which his schemes were received; while in the case of the old Catholics their dry "Garden-of-the-Soul" form of devotion, which had been stunted by the silent influence of Penal Laws, received a valuable corrective by contact with the manifold new devotions and confraternities and the like which were called for by the converts. Thus for example, the old-fashioned Catholics had a great devotion to the Blessed Virgin, as we see from their letters and from their books; but they were afraid to show it publicly, even in their own churches. They were shy of many practices such as praying before particular pictures or statues, or burning votive candles before them, and would have been almost shocked at the idea of carrying a statue in procession. They spoke of such practices as being "Continental," and were evidently suspicious of anything even tending towards them as though unsuited to their nature and temperament. But now that this shyness has long been overcome, we to-day can realise

the beneficial influence of such practices, and the true Catholic stamp of piety which they tend to develop.

Even, however, though the period of friction may have been necessary, and in the end worked its own cure, nevertheless for the time it caused division and difficulty, as we shall see in the following pages. The converts of that generation indeed learnt to respect the great domestic virtues of the old Catholics, and to reverence their firm and unquestioning faith; but they never fully understood them, and continued to the end to think that they were uneducated. The old Catholics, on the other hand, respected the zeal of the converts, and had an unstinted admiration for the courage they had shown in breaking away from their former ties; but they never quite trusted them, regarding them as innovators trying to reform that which they did not yet know, and longing for the excitement of founding new works when they might have been more profitably employed (they thought) in learning the fundamental daily practice of Catholic life.

It has been often noted that the Act of 1829 was a layman's Act. The clergy were practically unaffected by it,[1] and the limited toleration of Catholic worship which existed in England dated not from 1829, but from the earlier Act of 1791. There soon arose a movement for what may perhaps be called Ecclesiastical Emancipation. The Catholics were still a missionary body. They were ruled not by Bishops-in-ordinary, but by Vicars Apostolic who were nominally Bishops of Asiatic or African Sees "in partibus infidelium". Their priests, who had originally been simply "chaplains" to the gentry or to foreign ambassadors, were fast assuming, especially in the great towns, the position of parochial clergy; yet they had no official status as such. There was not even any clear distinction between Rector and Curates, the senior Chaplain being in substantially the same position as the juniors. The only rule by which they were governed was the bull *Apostolicum Ministerium*, issued by Benedict XIV. in 1753, which was in many respects inapplicable to the existing state of things. For it was written on the supposition that all the colleges and religious houses were abroad; and that all

[1] In fact, new restrictive laws against Monks and Jesuits were embodied in the Act, though they were never enforced: see Chapter xviii.

the priests were "chaplains" to the aristocracy, or at least supported by them. Not a word is mentioned about the method of appointment of a quasi-parish priest in a town; nor was there any security of tenure for him when appointed. For in 1753 all this depended practically on the lay patron. Careful regulations are laid down to secure the authority of the Vicars Apostolic over regulars as well as seculars, in all that concerned their missionary work, this having been so unfortunate a bone of contention in the past; but no regulations are given for the mutual relations of "chaplains" when —as in the London embassy churches—there were more than one, and it was assumed that there were no proper limits between adjacent missions in a town.

The remedy for this state of things was of course to be sought not from the English Government, but from the Holy See; but the toleration of the Government was the necessary condition both for that expansion which created the need, and for the possibility of supplying it. Until that toleration showed itself, there was little prospect of the Holy See even considering the question.

There can be no doubt that the movement for the Restoration of the Hierarchy set on foot by the Catholic Committee of 1782,[1] apart from its objectionable features, was premature. When the Relief Act of 1791 had been passed, the agitation was renewed, though not with any great vigour; and though Pitt had at first been favourable to the change, later on when the political state of the country called for all his attention, he begged the Catholics to drop the matter for the time.

A few years later, however, when the effect of the Act of 1791 began to make itself felt, some of the Vicars Apostolic themselves began to think that the time was approaching to petition for a hierarchy. When Dr. Poynter was in Rome in 1815, he drew out a regular scheme to bring forward. Owing to the further troubles in Rome, and the Pope having to leave for Genoa, it was never presented; but the document is nevertheless interesting, as showing the direction in which men's minds were moving at that time. The scheme—or rather the two alternative schemes—will be found printed in full in the

[1] See *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, i., p. 96.

Appendix.[1] It will be seen that Dr. Poynter's idea went beyond the appointment of Bishops, and he looked on the establishment of regular parishes as an essential part of his proposition. And he considered it as at least possible that the Government would give a regular endowment in the shape of salaries to Bishops and parish priests, for the second of his schemes is made out on that basis.

Dr. Milner continued to the end of his life strongly opposed to any form of petition for a hierarchy. His opposition was afterwards quoted, and proved a real impediment which had to be overcome before the measure could be passed. But it is questionable whether he would really have been against it on its merits. He had adopted an uncompromising attitude in opposition to the laity in 1782, and his opposition had prevailed. Naturally whenever there was any sign of the scheme reviving, he looked upon it in the same light as an encroachment on the jurisdiction of the Vicars Apostolic; and once he had taken up that attitude, he was not the man to listen to arguments in the opposite sense.

During the struggle for Emancipation, the idea of the hierarchy seems to have been dormant; but soon after the favourable termination of that struggle, it was revived. In the autumn of 1833 a correspondence was initiated on the subject in the *Catholic Magazine*, by a writer who signed himself "Catholic," and was a layman. His chief views are set forth in the following paragraph[2]:—

"The Catholic Church boasts, and that justly, of her constant and uninterrupted hierarchy, and why should England be excluded? No objection, I think, can be brought with any shadow of foundation from the opposition of the English Government. The Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland is acknowledged; Government objects not to the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, of Tuam, Cashel, Armagh, etc., why should it then object to our Bishops in England assuming the spiritual government, as far as Catholics are concerned, of the different towns in which they may please to fix their respective Sees, such as Durham, or York, or London, or Bristol, or Birmingham, or Wolverhampton, etc. The English Government recognises

[1] See Appendix A. [2] *Catholic Magazine*, November, 1833, p. 245.

the Archbishop of Quebec, the Bishop of Montreal, of York or Kingston, I know not which, in the Canadas, her colonies, and why should she defer from acknowledging English Bishops according to their respective Sees? Old England once formed a favourite portion of God's Church. It is time for her to re-assume her former position in the Christian world."

The correspondence was taken up by writers who disputed about the origin of government by Vicariates; but although their letters strayed rather wide of the mark, the Editor testified in 1835 that the question of the hierarchy was in the mouths of all. Rome realised that the time had come for some change in the ecclesiastical government of the country, though several partial schemes were put forward before the full measure of the hierarchy was proposed.

These will be described in the following pages. It is necessary now to acquaint ourselves a little more closely with the state of the Catholic body at the time we are going to deal with, and with the various discussions and developments which were proceeding at that time, and which became closely interwoven with the main question of the restoration of the hierarchy.

The actual surroundings of the Emancipation period soon passed away. King George IV. died in June, 1830; and the Duke of Wellington's Government came to an end in the following November. Within a few weeks came a still more important change, so far as Catholics were concerned, by the death of Pope Pius VIII., after a short Pontificate of only twenty months. Immediately after the death of the King, in accordance with the usual procedure, his successor was proclaimed as William IV. In the case of the Papacy, however, the usual formality of a Conclave followed, in order to decide who the next Pope should be; and the Conclave in this case was marked by incidents of importance which call for special remark on account of their bearing on English Catholicism.

It is not generally realised how near we were at this time to having a second English Pope, or at least one who was English on his mother's side. This was the well-known Cardinal Giustiniani, who through his mother, the Countess Mahony, was closely connected with several of our most distinguished Catholic families. His grandmother was a Clifford, and

his great-grandfather a Weld, while his brother by right, and his niece[1] in fact, inherited the title to the Newburgh peerage. In all human probability he would have been elected but for the Spanish right of veto being exercised; and had the Spanish Government foreseen the result of their action, they would certainly have refrained from it, for they would far rather have used their right to exclude the Pope who was actually elected. For their reason for objecting to Giustiniani was understood to have been connected with the appointment of Bishops in South America, in which he had taken a prominent part; but Cardinal Capellari, who was chosen for Pope, had taken an even more prominent part in the same matter.

The personality of the new Pope was of importance to the English Catholics for two reasons. One was that he had been for several years Prefect of Propaganda, so that he had considerable knowledge of their affairs, and might be presumed to have a special interest in the state of Catholicity in these islands, a presumption fully borne out by the events of his Pontificate. The other reason was that he was a member of the regular clergy—a monk of the Camaldolese Congregation. In view of the ancient difficulties between seculars and regulars in England, the remains of which still survived, this fact had an important bearing on the state of the mission.

Cardinal Capellari received the required number of votes on February 2, 1831, and was forthwith proclaimed, taking the title of Gregory XVI. At his coronation there was an unusual feature, due to his not being in Bishop's orders, in consequence of which his episcopal consecration had to be united with his coronation as Pope.

The English Vicars Apostolic still numbered four. In the Northern District, Bishop Smith—whose health had always been feeble—had evidently not much longer to live; and he had already secured a Coadjutor in Bishop Penswick. In the Midlands the good and pious Bishop Walsh ruled single-handed.

[1] This lady was naturalised as English by a special Act of Parliament in 1857. Her names and titles were sufficiently complicated to be worth giving in full: Princess Giustiniani, Marchioness Dowager Bandini, Countess of Newburgh, Viscountess Kynnaird, Baroness Levingstone of Flacraig in the peerage of Scotland, Maria Cecilia Agatha Anna Josepha Laurentia Donata Melchiora Balthassar Gaspara Giustiniani. She died in 1877.

In London, the aged convert Bishop, Dr. Bramston,[1] was showing that he had more life and vigour in him than he was commonly credited with; and he had a young and able Coadjutor in Dr. Gradwell, who after his ten years in Rome as Rector of the *Collegium Venerabile*, for a time filled an important part at this juncture, as a bond of union with the Holy See: for at that time, when Catholics in England were emerging from their obscurity, and when at the same time communication with the Holy See was becoming easier, it was no small advantage to have a Bishop who was familiar with Roman ways and methods. He had lived at the old Bishop's House in Castle Street, while Dr. Bramston continued—as before Dr. Poynter's death—to occupy his own house in Tavistock Street, Bedford Square; but the latter thought the time had now come to have a more dignified residence for the London Vicar, and he took a house in Golden Square, a few doors from the old ambassador's residence now occupied by the clergy. Both Dr. Bramston and Dr. Gradwell lived in this house, and attended Warwick Street Chapel. The old "pew"—for such it was—of the Vicars Apostolic, with its carved mitre, remained there for many years afterwards. They did not however make the Chapel in any sense do duty as their Cathedral, but continued to spend the greater festivals at St. Edmund's College, and to consecrate the Holy Oils there every Maundy Thursday.

We have left until last the mention of the Western District, for the Vicar Apostolic there—Dr. Baines—was by far the strongest personality among the English Bishops, and exercised a greater activity than any of his brethren. This activity, however, was combined with a strangely difficult temperament, and his episcopate was in fact one continued history of quarrels and disputes, which could not but be fraught with evil consequences to religion. Cardinal Wiseman's description

[1] This seems a suitable opportunity to settle finally the vexed question of Dr. Bramston's age. He is commonly put down as having been born in 1763, but Gillow questions whether he was not very much older. Mazière Brady (*Catholic Hierarchy*, p. 197) quotes a letter of his own, giving his age just ten years older than the above would make him, and this was accordingly accepted as decisive by the present writer (*Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, ii., p. 7 note). More recently, however, he has come across a letter in Dr. Bramston's own handwriting (*Downside Archives*, 1830, H. 23), giving his age in 1830 as sixty-seven, which agrees with the common tradition. He can only conclude that the letter in Mazière Brady was wrongly copied.

Bishop Bramston

(Aetat 70)

of him in his *Recollections of the Last Four Popes* is well known. He wrote as follows:—[1]

"[Dr. Baines] had a power of fascinating all who approached him, in spite of a positive tone and manner which scarcely admitted of a difference from him in opinion. He had sometimes original views upon a certain class of subjects; but on every topic he had a command of language, and a clear manner of expressing his sentiments which commanded attention, and generally won assent. Hence his acquaintances were always willing listeners, and soon became sincere admirers, then warm partisans."

"Unfortunately" (Wiseman continues) "this proved to him a fatal gift. When he undertook great and even magnificent works, he would stand alone: assent to his plans was the condition of being near him; anyone that did not agree, or that ventured to suggest deliberation, or provoke discussion, was soon at a distance; he isolated himself with his own genius, he had no counsellor but himself; and he who had at one time surrounded himself with men of learning, of prudence, and of devotedness to him found himself at last alone, and fretted a noble heart to a solitary death."

This account was much criticised by Bishop Baines's admirers,[2] but it appears to have been the reflection of Wiseman's own experience. For in Rome he had come at an early date under the Bishop's influence, and become successively a "willing listener," a "sincere admirer," and a "warm partisan". The grandeur of the Bishop's ideas, the largeness of his schemes, his intense hopefulness and enthusiasm for the future of English Catholicism was congenial to the mind of the future Cardinal, and when Dr. Baines asked him to become his Coadjutor, his heart went out to the prospect of helping him in his great schemes for the good of his country.

Moreover, notwithstanding the fact that Dr. Wiseman was a real student, and loved his books, nevertheless the steady monotony of College life was not suited to his tastes. He longed for more active work. During the last ten years of his rectorship he paid four visits to England, each of them lasting

[1] *Recollections*, p. 325.

[2] See, for example, Tierney's letter to the *Rambler* (June, 1858), afterwards reprinted in his pamphlet against Cardinal Wiseman.

at least several months, and one of them over a year. Anyone familiar with the interior of a College will realise that its interests must suffer by such prolonged absences. It is true indeed that we can now see how important was the work which Wiseman accomplished in England during those visits; but that would have been less evident at the time, and his frequent absence was a subject of disquiet to those in authority in Rome, including the Holy Father himself.[1]

Then, even while in Rome, he went out a good deal. He often preached at the churches, and gave courses of lectures, usually in the rooms of Cardinal Weld in the Odescalchi Palace. All this was good work; but it pointed to a craving for a larger sphere of activity than the inside of a College, and he was at first willing and anxious to give his services to Dr. Baines.

Very soon, however, some differences of opinion asserted themselves, with the result which he describes. Propaganda had refused for the time to allow him to become Coadjutor-Bishop; but there still seemed a prospect of his occupying an important post at Dr. Baines's new College at Prior Park, when a difference arose between them, and Dr. Wiseman had to turn his thoughts for the future in other directions. "Whatever little abilities I may possess"—he afterwards wrote—"whatever, small as it may be, I have been assisted by Divine Providence in doing were once at [Dr. Baines's] feet and at his free disposal. I cannot repine that he rejected them nor consider this otherwise than one of those over-ruled acts of a higher dispensation whereby our lives are turned into other channels than we had contemplated and even planned."

It will be well therefore at the outset to devote a short space to the history of the various disputes which occupied Dr. Baines during the early years of his government of the Western District, and to the strange circumstances connected with the foundation of the College at Prior Park.

[1] So Cardinal Fransoni told Dr. Griffiths when he visited Rome in 1837: see letter in the *Westminster Archives*.

CHAPTER II.

BISHOP BAINES AND THE BENEDICTINES: FOUNDATION OF PRIOR PARK.

In order to trace the disagreement between Bishop Baines and his own Benedictine Congregation to its origin, we must go back to the very beginning of his Episcopate, when in the year 1823 he was consecrated as Coadjutor to Bishop Collingridge. On taking a survey of the Western District—over which he was presumably one day to preside as Vicar Apostolic—he saw at once that the weak point was the want of any Seminary or College for the training of its ecclesiastical students, which might enable it in course of time to possess its own indigenous clergy, instead of depending for its supply on extraneous sources. Each of the other three Districts had already provided itself in this respect, Ushaw in the North, Oscott in the Midlands, and St. Edmund's in the South, being all by this time well established. In the Western District, indeed, the want was less pressing, for the great majority of the missions were served by regulars, chiefly those belonging to the English Benedictine Congregation, who were in many cases—but not in all—likewise the owners of the Chapels. The Vicar Apostolic himself had nearly always been a regular—either a Benedictine or a Franciscan—and in earlier times, when the secular clergy for all the Districts were educated together at Douay or other of the foreign Colleges, it was recognised that the Vicar Apostolic of the Western District had less interest in the conduct of those establishments than his colleagues.

Nevertheless, looking to the future, it was evident that the expansion of Catholic work in the District would be greatly benefited by any arrangement which would produce an indigenous body of priests, whether secular or regular. The existing monks of the Benedictine Congregation were educated

either as the older monks abroad, or more recently at Ampleforth or Downside, and they were appointed to serve missions in any part of England, independently of the Episcopal District. It was quite common to move a missionary from North to South or West, or *vice versa*. This necessarily prevented anything of the nature of local clergy serving the District.

The scheme which Bishop Baines thought out in order to remedy this defect was a bold one, and one which could only have been devised by a man of large ideas with an extended view of the future. It was, briefly, to constitute the Western District as practically a Benedictine See, with the monastery at Downside as its Seminary. He was himself a Benedictine, and he suggested that the future Bishops should be taken from that body, as is now the case with the Diocese of Newport,[1] or with that of Port Louis (Mauritius). Beyond this it would be necessary for him and his successors to become the ordinary superior of the Downside community, who would therefore cease their connection with the English Benedictine Congregation. Then, all the priests ordained at Downside were to be called upon to work in the Western District, unless their services were not required, in which case they might accept work temporarily elsewhere.

Notwithstanding the somewhat startling nature of this scheme, it must be admitted that there was nothing impossible in its realisation, and that it was not in itself inconsistent with monastic life. Benedictine and other monasteries have often existed and thriven under an episcopal superior even though the Bishop was not always himself a regular.[2] In view of the hostile reception which the proposal was accorded both at the time and afterwards, at the hands of the monks at Downside, it may be well to quote Dr. Baines's view of the probable

[1] The Chapter of Newport is Benedictine, and the Bishop has hitherto been taken from the English Benedictine Congregation; but there is no absolute rule against the appointment of one of a different Order, or a Secular, being appointed.

[2] This was the case at Canterbury before the Reformation, as well as in other episcopal sees which had monastic Chapters. There was a "Cathedral Prior" chosen from their own body, whose position was not very different from that of an ordinary Abbot. It would seem, however, from his letters that Dr. Baines was contemplating a position of more immediate authority over the monks, in which case it is difficult to see how it could have worked quite satisfactorily.

effect. In a letter which he wrote to the Benedictine Chapter in 1826, he expresses himself as follows :—[1]

"Having been educated by the Benedictine body, having spent in its bosom the greater part of my life, having during a long series of years formed amongst its members intimacies and friendships which I feel can never be broken, and which it is not likely can ever be replaced by others equally strong and interesting, it is natural that I should feel a warm attachment to that body, and a sincere anxiety for its prosperity. Such certainly are at present, and I trust ever will be my feelings towards it. I am grateful to it for the education I have received, for the kindnesses and indulgences that have been shown me, for the respectable situations in which I have been placed, and for many other advantages too numerous to be detailed, and I hereby return to the body my sincere acknowledgment for the same.

"Henceforward it will be my duty to make the interests of the District to which I have been appointed Vicar Apostolic my first and principal study. But as far as is consistent with those interests, I shall consider it a pleasure if not a duty to promote those of the Benedictine body to the utmost of my power, and I trust that opportunities of doing so may not be wanting. I see no reason why the interests of the Western District and the Benedictine body should ever conflict with each other, and I shall sincerely regret if on any future occasion they shall be found to do so. A careful suppression of all suspicions, jealous and party feelings, for which on my idea no just ground shall ever be afforded, and a diligent cultivation of mutual confidence and goodwill which the interests of religion and the relations of both parties render so desirable, will, I hope, enable us to be a constant support and assistance to each other, and to identify more and more our respective interests."

We can also quote Dr. Baines's definite statement to the Arbitrators in 1835 :—

"I solemnly declare that I intended this proposal to benefit the Benedictine body, not to injure it, and that I conscientiously believed that the measure would, if carried into effect,

[1] See the account of Dom Joseph Brown (*Downside Archives*).

be highly advantageous both to the Benedictine monks and to the Western District."

Notwithstanding all the good wishes of Dr. Baines, however, it is easy to see that the project which he laid before them in 1823 would not have commended itself to a community such as that at Downside. In the first place, the inevitable break with the English Benedictine Congregation, to which they had been bound by the closest ties since its very institution—of which indeed the Monastery of St. Gregory when established at Douay had been the first in order of time—would have been more than distasteful to them. Then the future, depending so largely on the personality of the Bishop for the time being, would be full of uncertainty. And to come still nearer home, they already felt a rooted distrust of Bishop Baines himself. His restless disposition while within his own monastery at Ampleforth was known to them by repute; while in recent years when he was their neighbour on the mission at Bath, they had been brought into close contact with his strange and complex character. They therefore unanimously rejected the proposal, and commissioned their Prior, Rev. F. L. Barber, to inform the Bishop of their decision.

Having failed in his application to Downside, Dr. Baines next turned his thoughts to his own monastery at Ampleforth; and here his scheme met with a very different reception. The community was in a somewhat distracted state. At the last election in 1818, they had only with great difficulty induced the Rev. Lawrence Burgess to accept the office of Prior, after several others had refused, he being then only twenty-seven years of age.[1] He was in many respects a successful administrator; but there was not unanimity among the community, and when the Benedictine Chapter held their quadrennial meeting at Downside in 1822, there was more than one appeal to be heard from Ampleforth. It was probably in view of these difficulties that the new scheme was welcomed by Prior Burgess and his associates; and they succeeded in gaining over for the time Dom Richard Marsh, the President-General (himself an Ampleforth monk), and other of their influential brethren on the mission.

[1] See *History of Ampleforth*, p. 308.

In order to carry the scheme into effect, however, it would have been necessary for the Communities of Ampleforth and Downside to exchange properties, it being understood that due compensation would be made to the Northern community for the difference in the value of their property. The Downside monks, however, sternly refused to agree to such exchange, or to take any part whatever in countenancing the proposed arrangement. This put an insuperable objection in the way, and for the time the whole scheme was dropped.

The abortive negotiations had thus produced a state of tension between the Benedictine body as a whole and Bishop Baines, which subsequent events unfortunately intensified. This was far from being agreeable to the Bishop, and he did all he could to bring about a better understanding. When the Benedictine Chapter was about to meet at Downside in July, 1826, he wrote a most conciliatory letter, part of which has already been quoted, to be placed before them. When the Chapter met, however, it was clear that there was a division of opinion amongst them. Matters came to an issue on the proposition that Dr. Baines, as a neighbouring Benedictine Bishop, should in accordance with a not unusual precedent[1] be invited to attend. The voting was taken by ballot, when the numbers were 13 to 8 against his being invited. He had indeed no strict right to attend; but in view of his position, his exclusion was an act of marked discourtesy, which he was not slow to feel. The decision was practically made known to him by a letter from Dom Placid Morris, as secretary, thanking him for his letter and reciprocating his good wishes. Dr. Baines was so angry that he returned the letter, with the following curt note:—

"SIR,

"I request you to return the enclosed to the persons who asked you to write it.

"P. A. BAINES, *Bishop of Siga.*

"BATHAMPTON, *July* 25, 1826."

[1] Not, however, an invariable one: for example, Bishop Slater, O.S.B., had not been invited to attend the Chapter of 1822. The following details are taken from a statement of the case drawn out by Dom Joseph Brown, O.S.B., *in futuram rei memoriam* now kept at Downside.

Before this letter arrived, the Bishop's supporters had drawn out a formal apology to send to him, dated July 23, 1826, and signed by two of the three "Definitors of the Regimen," the Provincial of the Northern Province, the Prior of Ampleforth, four other members of the Chapter—these being the eight who had voted for him—and three other Benedictine priests not members of the Chapter. Subsequently a second apology was sent on August 10, from Ampleforth, signed by all the monks there without exception.[1] The result of these two documents was to inform Dr. Baines as to who were his friends and who his enemies. The latter, who formed the majority, gave a further indication by electing for the new President-General the Rev. John Austin Birdsall, who was known to be the Bishop's strongest opponent. He was one of the priests of the Western District, having been stationed for some seventeen years at Cheltenham, where by his zeal and activity he had practically formed the congregation, and built the church. But he had an unfortunate asperity of character which showed itself in harsh language, which often defeated its own end and only gave a handle to his opponents. It is probably true to say that some at least of the unfortunate dissensions between the Bishop and the Benedictines might have been avoided by a little more restraint of language and action than he showed.

Although the original scheme of Bishop Baines had been frustrated he did not lose sight of it, and continued to hope that something of a similar nature might be found possible when the time came for him to succeed as Vicar Apostolic. For a while, however, it appeared doubtful whether that time would ever come. At the date when the Chapter was held his health was visibly breaking, and in the autumn he left England for a warmer climate. He spent the next two and a half years in Rome and Subiaco, and although he recovered his health in an unlooked-for manner, a further obstacle appeared in the proposal to create him a Cardinal, which would have involved his fixing his residence permanently in Rome.[2] It was just at this time, however, that Bishop Collingridge died, and all Dr. Baines's visions and schemes for the future of the

[1] The text of both these apologies is given in Appendix B.
[2] See *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, iii., p. 271.

Western District returned to his mind, and induced him to choose work in his own native country rather than dignity in exile, and he determined to return as Vicar Apostolic.

Before leaving Rome he had some very important conversations on the Seminary question with Cardinal Capellari, as he then was, the Prefect of Propaganda. He set forth two alternatives, one being the original Downside scheme, the other the foundation of a secular Seminary. In the latter alternative, he pointed out that there would be a rivalry between the new Seminary and the school at Downside, and for the success of the former it would be necessary either to suppress the school at Downside, or at least to put certain restrictions on it, the precise nature of which he did not specify. He gained the Cardinal over to his way of thinking, and Capellari wrote a letter to the Prior of Downside, dated July 28, 1829,[1] which he entrusted to Bishop Baines to deliver on his arrival. In this letter he disclaims any intention of deciding the various points of dispute, but begs the Prior to enter into the Bishop's views, and act in concert with him to forward his wishes by cordial co-operation.

A further and much more important question was raised by Bishop Baines, who propounded the startling theory that the Benedictine houses had been established in England without any formal permission on the part of the Holy See and of the local Bishops, as provided by Canon Law, and were consequently not canonically erected at all. If this contention could be established—and Cardinal Capellari apparently at first thought that it could—it would follow that they were not in possession of any exemption from episcopal control, and it was further contended that for a similar reason all the vows taken by their inmates were invalid. Thus, according to this theory, the Downside monks were ordinary missionary priests, subject to the Bishop.

A case was accordingly drawn out by the archivist Mgr. Carrega to be submitted to Propaganda; but in the meantime the Benedictines learned what was going forward from Dom Louis Cuthbert Spain, one of their number, who happened to be in Rome on business connected with the Mauritius. As a result of his expostulation, he obtained from Cardinal Capellari the very reasonable promise that the case should not be brought

[1] See Appendix B.

before Propaganda until the Benedictines had had an opportunity of putting forward their side of it.

Dr. Baines therefore left Rome with the question still undecided. He reached London on September 14, and finding that Dr. Bramston had gone down to St. Edmund's College, he followed him there. After a few days he resumed his journey, and finally arrived at his house at Bathampton, outside Bath, on September 23, 1829. He lost no time in communicating Cardinal Capellari's letter to Prior Barber, who came to Bathampton on October 1, together with Dom Joseph Brown, Professor of Theology, to discuss its contents. Bishop Baines received them, accompanied by Rev. Thomas J. Brindle, priest at Bath, whom he had made his Vicar General, and Dom Gregory Robinson, the Northern Provincial, all those present being thus Benedictines.

The meeting was, as might have been expected, of a very unsatisfactory nature. We have accounts of it written by both sides,[1] and each accuses the other of being uncourteous in their bearing. Dr. Baines offered to take over the Downside property if the monks cared to go elsewhere, or to allow them to manage the College as a diocesan Seminary. Failing either of these two alternatives, he laid down conditions which he considered necessary to safeguard the interests of the diocesan Seminary which he would in that case be compelled to found, appealing to Cardinal Capellari's letter in which he had declared that the Bishop's views on the matter appeared to be reasonable. These conditions included a limitation of the number of lay students which they could receive, an annual contribution to the proposed Seminary, and other such provisions. The Bishop also added that he considered them not as a community exempt from episcopal control, but only as ordinary missionary priests. The Provincial answered that this raised questions which would have to be discussed; and the Prior also said that he would have to take advice before he could give any answer to the alternatives placed before him. The meeting accordingly came to an end.

Immediately afterwards the monks deputed Dom Joseph Brown to study their case, and this he did with his usual

[1] See Bishop Baines's Statement to the Arbiters (*Clifton Archives*), Rev. T. Joseph Brown's Narrative (*Downside Archives*), and various letters on both sides.

thoroughness, coming to the conclusion that the canonicity of the erection of their houses in England could be established beyond doubt. He contended that the Canons required indeed that a new house should have the approval of the Bishop, but they nowhere prescribed that such approval should be given explicitly, much less that it should be in writing. It was sufficient—he contended—that the Bishop should show by his acts that he approved of the foundation, and regarded it as exempt from episcopal control: and this the Vicars Apostolic had done for many years past. With respect to the Holy See, permission had been obtained by their agent Dom Placid Waters, though owing to the disturbed state of Rome at that period, it had been given with less than the usual formality.

Having satisfied themselves that their case was good, the monks deputed Dom Richard Marsh to proceed to Rome in person, accompanied by Dom Joseph Brown, to argue the case before Propaganda; and they sent an intimation of their intention, with a short statement of the case, to Cardinal Capellari in October 25, 1829. The statement was signed by all the monks of Downside.[1]

In the meantime, as week after week passed away, and Bishop Baines received no answer from the monks, he wrote to Prior Barber on November 4, definitely demanding on what grounds they claimed exemption from episcopal control, and requiring an answer within four days. The Prior replied by refusing to state any grounds, contending that as the exemption had been recognised so long, the *onus probandi* rested with those who wanted to abolish it, adding that the whole matter had been referred to the Holy See. The Bishop replied by withdrawing all "faculties"[2] from the whole community—a step almost unparalleled in our ecclesiastical history, and one which alienated much sympathy from his

[1] See Appendix B.

[2] For the sake of those unaccustomed to technical terms, it may be explained that "faculties" include the granting of jurisdiction necessary for a priest before he can hear confessions. In the case of the confessions of the faithful generally, faculties are granted to a priest, whether secular or regular, by the Bishop; but in the case of the confessions of members of a religious community, faculties can be granted to a priest of that community by his religious Superior.

side, as well as causing him grave trouble in Rome. The measure indeed sounds so extraordinary that we find a difficulty in understanding its meaning. It is only just to the Bishop's memory therefore to give his own explanation, which fortunately, we are able to do from his subsequent statement.[1] He writes as follows:—

"The lofty and dignified style of the letter [of Prior Barber], the contemptuous silence which had preceded it, the secret mission to Rome, which now began to be generally believed, and I may add, the well-known hostility of the Prior and his party convinced me that no time must be lost in putting a stop to this rising quarrel. I had but one means of defence (I know of no other which a Vicar Apostolic ever has against regulars who are determined to resist), it was to withdraw the missionary faculties possessed by the monks of Downside. This was bringing the question to a fair trial. The monks claimed independent jurisdiction within their own walls, as being a canonically instituted monastery. If these claims were well founded, they required no faculties from the Bishop of the District for their own family. But if they were not canonically instituted, they could not administer the sacraments, even within their own walls without faculties from him. As I had reason to feel quite confident that they were not canonically instituted, I flattered myself that when the faculties were withdrawn, they would not dare to administer the sacraments, even within their own house, in which case they would tacitly acknowledge their dependence, and must come to some arrangement. I therefore withdrew the missionary faculties, and made over the care of the small congregation in the neighbourhood of Downside, consisting of about thirty communicants, to Dr. Coombes of Shepton Mallett."

In acknowledging the receipt of this order, the Prior wrote:[2]—

"No doubt my Lord you act under the influence of conscientious motives in asserting your authority in this matter; my motives in refusing to receive that authority are not less pure. . . . I have referred my cause to the Holy See. Its decision I await with perfect tranquillity. It is unnecessary

[1] Statement to the Arbiters (*Clifton Archives*).
[2] *Downside*, by Rev. N. Birt, O.S.B., p. 202.

to say that we shall not presume to exercise the faculties which as Vicar Apostolic of the Western District you have withdrawn."

It soon appeared that the view taken by the monks was that the suspension only applied to ministration to externs, and that within the monastery their position was secure. Hence they continued to hear the confessions not only of the monks, but also of the boys belonging to the school. Dr. Baines accordingly proceeds :—

"I was mistaken in my calculation ; the monks quietly continued to administer the sacraments within their own walls, as if there were no doubt of the Canonical existence of their house, and they represented my withdrawing the faculties as an act of tyranny towards them, and of cruelty to the congregation, particularly their neophytes and converts, of which they pretended to have a great number."

It had now of course become clear that no agreement with the Downside monks would be reached, and without waiting further, Bishop Baines entered into negotiations for the purchase of the mansion and property at Prior Park, in a commanding situation just outside Bath, formerly belonging to Ralph Allen, the friend of the poet, Alexander Pope, consisting of a large mansion standing in 180 acres of ground, which was then for sale. The price eventually agreed upon was £22,000—a small amount considering the value of the property—which it now devolved on him to raise. But the purchase of the material building was the smallest part of his enterprise. The great difficulty was to provide a staff. With the single exception of Dr. Coombes of Shepton Mallett, then over sixty years of age, who had been a Professor at Douay, and Vice-President of St. Edmund's College, there was no one in the Western District with any scholastic capability.

It was at this stage a new figure appeared on the scene, that of Prior Burgess, who visited Dr. Baines, and invited him to spend the winter at Ampleforth. In view of after events, it is important to note that the first move came from Ampleforth ; but in accepting the Prior's invitation, there can be little doubt that Dr. Baines had in mind the plan which he afterwards brought off with success. Nevertheless, he states definitely to Cardinal Capellari that the primary motives of

his visit were partly to benefit his health, to exchange the damp winter of Bath for the bracing cold of the Yorkshire moors; partly to be away while the purchase of Prior Park was being completed, so that it might not be known that he was the purchaser; and partly because he was told that his presence might help to bridge over the unhappy dissensions then prevailing in the monastery.

On his way to the North, Bishop Baines attended a meeting of Vicars Apostolic which was held at Wolverhampton from November 20 to 24, 1829.[1] It was an important meeting—the first since the granting of Emancipation—and amongst other matters awaiting discussion was the question of the lawfulness of the oath imposed on Catholic Members of Parliament by that Act before they could take their seats; the proposed abolition of the Saturday abstinence, a petition for which was sent to Rome, and met with success; and the reduction of the number of holidays of obligation to be observed in England.[2] But a discussion of more immediate consequence was raised on a proposed revision of the boundaries of the four Districts, which calls for more extended notice.

When Dr. Baines was preparing to return to England, he realised that the Western District was the least important of the four, not on account of any great difference in size, but on account of the paucity of Catholics in that part of the country, especially in the Principality of Wales; while the Northern District was correspondingly more important than the others on account of the large number of Catholics in Lancashire and other parts of the North. He accordingly thought out a redistribution scheme, which would give each Bishop approximately the same number of Catholics under his jurisdiction, the chief exchange of territory being consequently between his District and the Northern. It is an instructive commentary on the influence which he had gained over Cardinal Capellari that the latter threw in all the weight of his position in favour of the scheme, which he asked the other Vicars Apos-

[1] Dr. Baines always gives November 18 as the day of the Bishops' meeting and the other Bishops in their letter to Rome do the same. That was perhaps the day for which they were called together; but the actual sessions were on the days indicated in the text, as appears from the official minute book.

[2] See *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, iii., p. 272.

Map of the English Mission
Placed before Propaganda by Bishop Baines in 1829, to support his petition for the re-arrangement of the "Districts."
Northern District
Midland District
Western District
Southern or London District
Seat of a Vicar Apostolic
Residence of Regulars
Seminary
Mission
D. SEPTENTRIONALIS
D. MEDIUS
D. OCCIDENTALIS
D. MERIDIONALIS
NORTHUMBERLAND
CUMBERLAND
WEST-MORLAND
DURHAM
Durham
Ampleforth
I. of Man
I. of Anglesea
FLINT
DENBIGH
CARNARVON
MERIONETH
CHESHIRE
LANCASTER
YORK
DERBY
NOTTINGHAM
LINCOLN
MONT-GOMERY
SALOP
Wolverhampton
LEICESTER
RUTLAND
NORFOLK
CARDIGAN
RADNOR
BRECKNOCK
HEREFORD
WORCESTER
WARWICK
NORTHAMPTON
BEDFORD
HUNTING-DON
CAMBRIDGE
SUFFOLK
PEMBROKE
CARMARTHEN
GLAMORGAN
MON-MOUTH
GLOUCESTER
OXFORD
BUCKINGHAM
HERTFORD
ESSEX
London
Bath
Downside
WILTS
BERKS
HANTS
SURREY
KENT
SOMERSET
SUSSEX
DEVON
DORSET
CORNWALL
I. of Wight
I. of Guernsey
I. of Jersey
Note:-
The lines from the Monasteries of Downside and Ampleforth to various missions indicate that they were Benedictine missions served from those monasteries respectively.
Emery Walker Ltd. sc.

tolic to consider and report upon. It is not, however, surprising that they were opposed to the whole scheme. A little consideration will show that a substantial alteration in the boundaries of any diocese would be in any case a difficult plan to carry out. A diocesan District grows into an organic whole, with its various institutions and funds connected with the different parts of the diocese, a re-division of which would lead to endless complications. In the case of England, it should be added that the change would be an unwelcome one to the laity, who have usually become attached to their District or Diocese, and on whom its support in the main depends. All this is generally recognised, and changes of this nature are nearly always made by subdividing a diocese into two; and even then it is not accomplished without frequent questions arising which are difficult of solution.

The Vicars Apostolic answered in this sense, at the same time pointing out that the administration of Wales by the Western Vicar was practically a geographical necessity. There can be no doubt that one of Dr. Baines's primary motives in suggesting the change was to increase the importance, as well as the resources, of his hoped-for new Seminary or College, and in this he was disappointed. A more unfortunate result was that the somewhat abrupt negative of the Vicars Apostolic was not pleasing to Cardinal Capellari, and formed the beginning of a series of misunderstandings with the English Bishops which developed to serious proportions after he became Pope.

With respect to Dr. Baines's dispute with the Benedictines, his brother Bishops were more sympathetic, and Dr. Walsh undertook to write to the Rev. John Birdsall, with a view to bringing about a settlement on the lines of the letter of Cardinal Capellari of July 28, 1829. He immediately fulfilled his promise, but wrote so inconclusive a letter that it is worth giving in full on that very account:—[1]

"WOLVERHAMPTON, *21st November*, 1829.

"I have duly received your letter of the 17th November, and I am sure that I not only express my own sentiments but those of all the Vicars Apostolic in declaring also our earnest desire

[1] Archives at Bishop's House, Leeds.

that the English mission should never be deprived of the decoration and services of that holy Order. I beg further to express, and in perfect union with all the other Vicars Apostolic, that I feelingly desire that the Western District may flourish equally with all the other Districts, and that no impediment should arise to the establishment in that District of an Episcopal Seminary, which appears necessary for the hallowed purpose of providing missionaries, of propagating our holy religion, and promoting the salvation of souls. It is earnestly wished that every friendly co-operative disposition be manifested, and that perfect peace and harmony be secured amidst the whole of the teaching body within the English mission. The other Vicars Apostolic and myself have attentively considered the excellent letter of his Eminence the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda, dated the 28th July, 1829, and addressed to the Prior and Monks of Downside. All the Vicars Apostolic and myself declare this respected letter of his Eminence to express our sentiments. I have only to add my prayer that *Omnia in charitate fiant.*"

It is perhaps hardly a matter of surprise that with feeling running so high as it did, a letter such as the above did not produce the effect intended, as we shall see presently.

On the conclusion of the Bishops' meeting, Dr. Baines continued his journey to Ampleforth, where he tells us he had a very mixed reception. The three Superiors, the Rev. Thomas L. Burgess, Prior, the Rev. Thomas Rooker, Sub-Prior, and the Rev. Edward P. Metcalfe, Procurator, welcomed him with all cordiality; but the other monks had by this time been won over to the opposite side, and they were so uncivil that the Bishop had to give up dining in the Refectory. At first the cleavage between the two parties was complete, and the plans of Dr. Baines were only known to the three Superiors. On December 4, the Bishop wrote to Cardinal Capellari requesting that these three might be allowed to transfer their obedience to himself, if necessary even by being dispensed from their vows, which (he contended) they had invalidly taken; and he added also the name of his Vicar General, Rev. Thomas Brindle of Bath. On the same day the three Ampleforth Superiors sent a petition to a like effect, in due Canonical form; but it is noticeable that the requisite testimonials in

their favour had been signed by Bishop Smith at Wolverhampton on November 25—the day after the conclusion of the Bishops' meeting and before Dr. Baines had arrived at Ampleforth—thus showing that the scheme had been thought out during the stay of Prior Burgess at Bathampton, as previously mentioned.

Several weeks elapsed after this without any special incident, until by an indiscretion on the part of a visiting monk the fact became known among the community that the validity of their vows was being called in question. This naturally made them feel unsettled, and by this time the influence of Dr. Baines's winning personality had made itself felt, and the great schemes which he was forming for the development of Catholicity in the West had a glamour which proved a great attraction to the younger members of the community. It is perhaps hardly to be wondered at that they became eager to have a part in these great schemes, and approached the Bishop on the subject. He tells us, however, that he discouraged any plans of change at least until the decision of the Holy See on the question of the validity of their vows had been made known ; and in point of fact, when he returned home in March, no decision had as yet arrived.

Rome moves proverbially slowly, and the present case formed no exception to the rule. When the two Benedictine monks reached the Eternal City, in the month of November, they were received at first somewhat coolly. Cardinal Capellari considered that the measure they had taken was too abrupt; that some attempt at least should have been made to come to terms with Bishop Baines; and that an appeal to Rome should have been the very last resort. During their stay in Rome, however, the two Benedictines improved their position considerably, while at the same time the extraordinary action of Dr. Baines with respect to the Downside faculties prejudiced him in the eyes of the Roman authorities. Cardinal Capellari indeed ordered him to restore the monks' faculties ; but the reasons he gave led to further correspondence, and in the end the question of the vows was settled first. This came before a Congregation held on March 1 ; the decision was ratified by the Pope on the 7th; and the decree was issued on the 13th.

The decision was of the nature of a compromise, on lines said to have been suggested by Dr. Wiseman. On the historical question of the previous Canonical establishment of the Benedictine houses, "the authorities in Rome decided to give no definite ruling";[1] but what is called a "Sanatio" or decree of healing, was issued, making good any possible defects in the past, so that from that day forward the vows of the monks became certainly valid, and their exemption from episcopal control was confirmed. This was accompanied by a second decree, conceding the petition for secularisation of the three Superiors, together with Rev. Thomas Brindle, and transferring them to the obedience of Bishop Baines.

It might have been almost expected that in the very delicate position in which the three Superiors found themselves, they would have handed over their charge, and departed as quietly as possible. Such, however, was far from being the course which they pursued. They aimed at inducing as many as possible of the boys to follow them to Prior Park, and it would help to this end if they could produce the impression that the whole school was moving to a new locality, and that the boys who accompanied them would be taught by the same masters as before, in new and better surroundings. The Prior used his influence with the parents, and between twenty and thirty boys—out of a total at that time of about sixty—some of families of position and influence, left for Prior Park. The professed monks were unable to leave since the issue of the sanatory decree, which confirmed their vows; but three novices—Revv. Leonard Calderbank, Moses Furlong, and Peter Hutton—came away. Finally, the Rev. Edward Metcalfe, who left last, hired a number of wagons in which he loaded all pictures and furniture which could be considered to have been given to those who were leaving for their personal use, or by any title to belong to them; and the procession ended with a large herd of cattle, for which a sum of £790 was paid as compensation, all to be driven the whole way to Bath. In passing through York, needless to say, they created no small stir, Ampleforth being sufficiently near to be known

[1] *History of Ampleforth*, by Dom Cuthbert Almond, O.S.B., p. 316.

PRIOR PARK

(Showing the projected Church, which was never built)

there.[1] The convoy had a successful journey, and eventually reached Prior Park in safety.

Under these extraordinary circumstances the new episcopal College was opened in the "Mansion House" (as it came to be called) at Prior Park. At the very outset the strange manner of its foundation caused difficulty. The Bishop nominated the Rev. Thomas Brindle as "Regent"; and when Rev. Thomas Burgess learnt of this appointment, he declared his willingness to accept any position from the highest to the lowest; but no suitable post could be found, and he retired to the mission. Moreover, Rev. Edward Metcalfe was dissatisfied with the arrangements and he too left. Of the three Ampleforth Superiors therefore, only the Rev. Thomas Rooker took a permanent part in the new foundation. Two of the three Benedictine novices continued there, and they were re-enforced by the Rev. H. C. Logan, a Cambridge convert, who had been received into the Church by Bishop Baines. He had studied his theology at the English College in Rome, returned to England in 1830, and was ordained by Bishop Baines in Advent of that year.

Bishop Baines now drew out plans for the contemplated extension of the building on a large scale. There was to be a College at one end of the establishment dedicated to St. Peter, for the younger boys, and another at the other end dedicated to St. Paul, for the seniors, including those who had passed school age, and were precluded by their religion from entering Oxford or Cambridge. The two Colleges were to be connected with the "Mansion House" by nearly a quarter of a mile of cloister, under a semicircular colonnade. As time went on the Bishop's ideas grew, and he formed visions of a future Catholic University with Dr. Wiseman—whether raised to the episcopate or not—as its first Rector.[2] To complete the buildings, there was to be an imposing church in the classical style, with a high dome, as the crowning feature of the whole pile.

[1] These particulars are given in a letter quoted in Dom Joseph Brown's statement.

[2] See letter of Bishop Baines to Dr. Wiseman, December 28, 1834, in which he alludes to his schemes for the future of Prior Park. See also *Catholic Magazine*, December, 1834, p. cxciv.

It is hardly necessary to add that his scheme was never fully realised, for reasons we shall come across later on; but a very considerable amount was accomplished. The church was never built;[1] but the two Colleges can be seen at the present day, together with the Mansion House, standing on raised terraces, and occupying one of the finest sites in the country.

At the time we are concerned with, the building of St. Peter's College was commenced. While it was in course of construction, Dr. Baines took up his residence in the Mansion House, where he kept great state compared with the simple way in which the Vicars Apostolic had hitherto lived. He had a suite of apartments to himself, opening into a private Oratory, in which he said his Mass apart from the rest of the College; and he also had a separate dining-room all to himself. His personality dominated the whole College. Mgr. Shepherd, who was one of those who as a boy left Ampleforth for Prior Park, writing many years afterwards, corroborated the general traditions to this effect. "From my own experience," he writes,[2] "I can testify to the truth of what is stated about Dr. Baines. His appearance in Cappa Magna as he entered the sanctuary and sat in his *sedilia* (*sic*) to preach to us was very imposing—the more so perhaps because we were quite unaccustomed to the sight. His sermons to this day remain deeply impressed on my mind—what Cardinal Wiseman says of his preaching in Rome is exactly what I would wish to say. . . . 'The flow of his words was easy and copious, his imagery was often very elegant, and his discourses were replete with thought and solid matter. But his great power was in his delivery, in voice, in tone, in look, in gesture. His whole manner was full of pathos; there was a peculiar tremulousness of his voice which gave his words more than double effect. He was considered by all that heard him one of the most eloquent and learned preachers they had ever attended.' The prestige which he enjoyed ere he came amongst us also tended to enhance the awe and respect with which we regarded him; for Pope Leo XII. had taken preliminary steps to making him a Cardinal. . . . He was familiar with the Pontifical

[1] *I.e.* not as then contemplated. [2] *Reminiscences of Prior Park*, p. 5.

functions at St. Peter's; he was well versed in the antiquities and architectural beauties of Rome, and his conversations on these subjects were highly entertaining and instructive. No wonder then that the inmates of Ampleforth College, and particularly the young men, were anxious to place themselves under the direction of so experienced a guide, and to avail themselves of the advantageous offers which he made them."

On the state of Prior Park when fully established under Dr. Baines's direction, we may call a sympathetic witness in Dom Bernard, afterwards first Abbot of Mount St. Bernard's Abbey in Leicestershire. He visited the College in 1837, and his impressions are described in the following terms:—[1]

"Father Bernard says that in that College there is a piety, a regularity, a recollection, a zeal for the honour of God and the advancement of the Catholic Faith which he can never think of without feeling his heart ravished with excessive joy. Father Bernard says that Bishop Baines is one of the most glorious Bishops in the whole Catholic Church. He cannot speak of him without tears of joy to God for having raised up such a man in England."

[1] Letter of Mr. Lisle Phillipps to Father Gentili, dated June 22, 1837 (*Clifton Archives*).

CHAPTER III.

BISHOP BAINES AND THE BENEDICTINES (*continued*).

AFTER the events detailed in the last chapter it was hardly to be expected that Bishop Baines and the Benedictines would be on very good terms. It is true indeed that the Benedictine authorities signed a legal document accepting the title deeds and other securities from the three former Superiors at Ampleforth, and declaring that they were satisfied with the financial settlement arrived at;[1] but they always afterwards complained that they were practically compelled to sign it in view of the position in which they found themselves. In reporting the settlement to Bishop Smith, who had been deputed by the Holy See to carry it out, the Rev. J. A. Birdsall stated plainly his dissatisfaction. Writing on May 15, 1830, he says:—[2]

"In announcing to your Lordship the conclusion of this part of the evils that have come upon us by the late unaccountable proceedings against us, I cannot refrain from expressing the sense we entertain of your Lordship's kindness and regard towards us, which indeed is the more entertained by us because, as is natural, it cannot be wholly known to your Lordship to what extent and in how many respects those evils afflict us. You say in your letter to me that it will give you satisfaction to know that we are satisfied. But my Lord, if I must say we are satisfied, it is the satisfaction of necessity, the satisfaction of helplessness. The gentlemen concerned had had the confidence of their confreres placed in them. The whole of this property had been invested in their names, and having the legal power to withhold it from us, we have been compelled to come to their terms and to

[1] See Appendix B.
[2] See Dom Joseph Brown's Statement (*Downside Archives*).

suffer an adjustment of things which no indulgence nor forensic opinion can induce us to regard as equitable."

He proceeds to make several specific complaints, accusing them of concealing the details of the school accounts, with more than an insinuation that they had not been accurately stated, that various moneys which had been thought to have been given to the monastery were now stated to have been only lent, and had been carried off to Prior Park; as also an amount of personal property far in excess of what they could reasonably claim as their own.[1] He even accused them of mortgaging part of the Ampleforth property for £6000, implying that they had carried this sum off too—an implication which was by others definitely asserted.

There can be little doubt that Bishop Baines thought that after what had happened Ampleforth as a monastery would come to an end. In a letter dated April 14, 1830, he writes:[2] "Mr. Birdsall says in his letter to Mr. Cooper (as I understand) that 'Ampleforth shall prosper'. Pompey said something similar, and in my opinion just about as wise." In this however he turned out mistaken. Both monastery and school survived the crisis. The Downside Community came to their aid, and lent them two monks in their hour of difficulty, one being Dom Bernard Ullathorne, the future Bishop. But Downside itself suffered almost as severely, in consequence of the nearness of Prior Park. The monks did not indeed pay the annual stipend which had been demanded of them, but apart from the trouble connected with the question of their faculties, they suffered by the number of boys in their school showing a notable diminution in consequence of the competing College. Naturally as they lived in Bishop Baines's district the brunt of the bad relations fell on their shoulders.

The state of strain was on both sides. Dr. Baines never gave the monks an order, even concerning missionary affairs, which were admittedly within his province, without attaching

[1] Although the Benedictines took a vow of Poverty, in the existing state of affairs those on the mission were unable to observe it strictly, and it was customary to allow each a limited amount of private property, styled a "peculium". It was held subject to certain restrictions, and at death it passed to the Order. With the development of Catholicity the need ceased, and the system was abolished in 1858 for all those professed after that date.

[2] *Clifton Archives.*

the penalty of suspension *ipso facto* in case of non-compliance; they on their side disregarded his orders whenever he went a hair's-breadth beyond what they considered he had a strict right to; and in all such matters they showed their distrust by refusing any request short of a command.

With respect to the dissatisfaction of the Benedictines at the Ampleforth settlement, as they had signed the deed of acceptance no legal redress remained at their disposal to remedy any possible grievances, nor any way of testing the rights and wrongs of the case in a Court of Law. They found, however, another way of trying to assert what they considered their rights, which had a very complicating influence on the general situation. In order to explain this we must go back a few years and give further details of the last years of Bishop Collingridge.

As soon as he found that Dr. Baines's health was failing, and that it was likely that he would not return from Rome alive, Dr. Collingridge looked about him for another Coadjutor. It is said that his choice fell on Rev. John Birdsall, and that had Dr. Baines died, he would have been appointed. As it was Dr. Collingridge not only made him his Vicar General, but also remade his will, and nominated Rev. John Birdsall and Dr. Bramston his two executors. On his death, Dr. Baines at once appointed Rev. Thomas Brindle Vicar General, to administer the District until his own arrival; but he was not able to interfere with the executorship. Dr. Bramston refused to act, and President Birdsall accordingly took out letters of administration and became legally possessed of various funds belonging to the Western District. These he now refused to surrender until a settlement more equitable —in his opinion—had been arrived at in the Ampleforth business. He defended this extraordinary step by pleading that Dr. Baines had always identified himself with the actions of the late Ampleforth Superiors, and that therefore the debt which he contended to be due to Ampleforth was his as well as theirs. This caused an *impasse* which the forces at the Bishop's disposal were powerless to overrule.

Another unfortunate dispute arose in regard to the mission at Bath, which with its fashionable congregation was by far the richest and most important in the Western District. The

Benedictines claimed that as the Rev. Thomas Brindle, the head chaplain, had been secularised, he was bound to withdraw from the mission. Dr. Baines replied by refusing to give faculties to anyone in his place, putting forward the strange contention that the church belonged, not to the Benedictines, but to the congregation who had subscribed to build it. He had himself acted for some years as one of its chaplains, even after he had become Bishop, and more than one of his predecessors had lived there. Dr. Baines contended that this was a proof that the money had been subscribed at least partly in order to provide a suitable home for the Bishop of the District. The rejoinder of the Benedictines was the issue of a circular to the subscribers, and to all who paid rent—for there was some property belonging to the mission—warning them that no payment would be acknowledged as legal unless made to the Benedictine body. This circular was distributed in the church in the very presence of Dr. Baines, when he was about to preach. His reply was to forbid any payments to anyone, under pain of ecclesiastical censure, until the matter should be settled. Eventually he gave way, and allowed Mr. Brindle to hand over the church and property to the Benedictines; but at the same time he hired a house at the other end of the town in which in 1832 he opened a new mission; and the influence of the Bishop and Vicar General soon attracted a large part of the congregation, most of them their own penitents, to the new chapel. The Benedictines resented this action and appealed to Rome; while Rev. John Birdsall, in order to make himself proof against the Bishop's censures, voluntarily surrendered his faculties, saying that if he retained them, he would "become a traitor to the trust reposed in him in forbearing to vindicate his own and his brethren's rights".

A further dispute arose, the reverse of edifying, which had better be told in the Bishop's own words. He writes as follows:—[1]

"The mission of Bath had been to the Benedictine body a source of no small emolument. My predecessor in that mission, the Rev. Mr. Calderbank, carried away from this fertile field, after holding it for fourteen years, some say

[1] Statement for the Arbiters (*Clifton Archives*).

£8000, others £6000. At his death, which happened some years after, he left to the Benedictine house of Ampleforth in the Northern District £4000. . . . Whilst the monks could continue to reap so rich a harvest in Bath, I saw clearly that they would listen to no terms of accommodation, and as it was extremely injurious to the District to have in it a succession of clergy who collected and carried away the greatest part of its available revenue to places out of the District, and for objects foreign to its wants, I thought it my duty to diminish their attachment to Bath by reducing its emoluments as much as I could consistently with justice. They had introduced not many years before the custom of demanding from those who did not rent sittings in the chapel a shilling on entrance. . . . I therefore felt no scruple as far as Bath was concerned in abolishing this impost, which was always objectionable in itself, and the custom existed in no other chapels but Cheltenham and Bristol. . . . I therefore issued an order, dated October 4, 1830, forbidding compulsory payments to be made at the chapel doors, and as I knew the order would not be obeyed in some places unless given under a censure, I gave it under pain of suspension *ipso facto*. Also lest some one might explain away the force of the prohibition by private interpretation, I ordered the pastoral containing the prohibition to be read publicly in the different chapels. It was read at Cheltenham and evaded. I am assured that Mr. Birdsall himself took his station at the door of the chapel, with a plate in his hand, and intimated that though there was no compulsion to pay, he should consider any person not paying as taking the bread out of his mouth."

It has sometimes been questioned why it is that in English-speaking countries the charge for seats is always higher than abroad; but one reason surely is that in these countries alone it is usual for the priest to live on nothing but the offerings of the people.[1] Nevertheless, it is a custom which cannot but be considered regrettable and only to be justified on the plea of necessity, and it is manifestly an abuse when there is no place in the chapel for those who cannot

[1] To these countries France must of course now be added, since the abolition of the Concordat. But the ecclesiastical customs in that country date from a period when the Church had regular means of support.

afford to pay. It was expressly laid down in the Second Provincial Council of Westminster in 1856 that sufficient free space should be provided, as was indeed already done in the great majority of cases; and more recently the Holy See has called attention to the question in connection with the Church in America. In the case of the Bath mission the order of Dr. Baines was obeyed for some months, until the general appeal to Rome came on.

During all this time the question of the faculties of the Downside monks still remained unsettled. In the ordinary course, the faculties would have expired at the end of the year 1829, and it would have been incumbent on the monks to apply for their renewal. In existing circumstances, however, they refused to ask for anything, and simply awaited developments. Dr. Baines therefore took the next step, which was to offer to restore the faculties provided that the monks would accept from him a conditional absolution for any censure they might have incurred by administering sacraments after he had withdrawn their faculties, and before the arrival of the "Sanatio" from Rome. He explained that he did not wish to imply that they had acted wrongly, but only to absolve them *in case* they had so acted—"ad cautelam," as it is termed. This was of course meant as a way of leaving the old dispute undecided, and allowing it to be forgotten, and perhaps of saving the Bishop's dignity. The monks however, indignantly refused the proposition.

In 1830 a new Prior was elected—Rev. George Turner, who had been in the North of England during the time in question. Dr. Baines was able therefore to give him faculties without raising any question. He likewise found one of the junior monks willing to accept his conditional absolution. Hence there were two priests with faculties, which was ample for the small village congregation. Nevertheless, the action of the Bishop was not approved by the elder members, including the Sub-Prior,[1] who felt insulted by his junior possessing faculties which he himself was without. Eventually, having received a further letter from Rome, Dr. Baines went to Downside, accompanied by his Vicar General (Dr. Brindle),

[1] Rev. F. B. Polding, afterwards Archbishop of Sydney.

Dr. Coombes, and Rev. T. Burgess, and announced that he had come to make peace. He then commissioned his Vicar General to arrange terms, and himself withdrew into the Chapel. As a result of the conference, it was agreed that the Bishop should empower the Prior to nominate any two monks he should choose to have faculties for the congregation.

So far as the faculties were concerned, the question was now settled; but the monks continued to complain of their treatment at the hands of the Bishop, and they spoke in vague terms of many things he had done and was still doing to their prejudice.

Matters in Rome, however, came to a temporary standstill through the death of the Pope and the Conclave to appoint a successor. The election of Cardinal Capellari brought the foremost figure in the negotiations into the Papal chair. He took the matter up, and in December, 1831, commissioned Dr. Bramston to inquire into the whole matter and report to Rome, with such recommendations as he should see fit to make.

There now seemed some prospect of matters being discussed before an impartial tribunal, and some settlement being arrived at. Unfortunately the prospect was not realised, the Rev. John Birdsall sending what was practically a refusal to submit to any kind of arbitration. Bishop Bramston, writing to Dr. Baines on January 19, 1832, describes the letter as "angry and insulting, prescribing such preliminaries and conditions to the conference as [he] could not sanction". On the same day he wrote to President Birdsall as follows:—[1]

"*January* 19, 1832.

"VERY REV. SIR,

"From the sentiments expressed in the letter which you did me the honour to write to me on the 16th instant, I see that no good can possibly result from my meeting you at Prior Park on 7th February. Hence I am absolutely determined not to go into Somersetshire as I intended.

"I have the honour to remain, Very Revd. Sir,

"Your very obedient humble servant,

"+ J. Y. BRAMSTON."

Unfortunately we do not possess a copy of President Birdsall's letter which practically put an end to the negotiations;

[1] *Downside Archives.*

but Cardinal Weld, having afterwards seen a copy, wrote as follows :—

"I am not at all surprised that [Bishop Bramston] should refuse to interfere after receiving such a letter from you. I must say, my dear Sir, that I cannot agree with you in thinking that arbitration should be refused because you have right on your side; and that an arbitration necessarily supposes that the case is a doubtful one. How often are disputes submitted to arbitration to avoid the scandal or expense of a lawsuit. If your case is a good one and the arbitrators are just, what have you to fear more in one case than the other? You may say that you did not refuse the arbitration; but you accepted of it in such a manner that it was not to be supposed that the result should be different from what it was.

"I trust you will pardon the liberty I now take in making my observations so freely, in hopes that you may be induced to accept of another proposal for accommodation, which I suppose will shortly be offered to you, through Dr. Wiseman, and I flatter myself will be such as to enable you to settle Dr. Collingridge's affairs, and relieve you from the sad state in which you have been so long suffering. God grant that this may be the result."

The proposal of Propaganda here indicated was duly made, and Dr. Wiseman travelled all the way to England to act as intermediary in the dispute. He arrived in September, 1832; but he met with no better success than Dr. Bramston. He went indeed to Cheltenham in company with Bishop Baines; but President Birdsall absolutely declined to have a conference as proposed, saying that he "would not have his legs under the same table with that man". He gave Dr. Wiseman many documents designed to establish his case, and the latter returned to Rome at the end of the year, having effected nothing. His visit to England nearly cost him his life, for on his return journey, near Turin, the conveyance in which he was travelling was overturned, and he was carried senseless to a neighbouring cottage. Fortunately, however, no bones were broken, and after a delay of some days he was able to proceed on his way, and by means of a great effort, succeeded in reaching the English College just in time

for High Mass, on St. Thomas's Day.[1] The College feast was being kept with unusual solemnity. No less than elevenCardinals assisted at the Mass, while the Pope's own choir sang the music. Dr. Wiseman was able to preside at the dinner, apparently, except for a slight lameness, little the worse for his adventure.

A few words must be added at this stage about another difficulty which confronted Bishop Baines at this time, which was in his belief not wholly unconnected with that which we have been considering. It concerned the community of Benedictine nuns then settled at Cannington near Bridgwater. There had already been some friction between the Prioress and the Bishop on a matter of finance, but soon a more important difficulty arose. When the Rev. T. Burgess left Prior Park, he had become confessor to the nuns and pastor to the congregation, the nuns retaining their former ordinary chaplain, Abbé Prémord. Soon afterwards dissensions arose in the community, and there appeared to be two parties among the nuns. Such difficulties are at all times liable to occur in an enclosed community, but in the present instance the Bishop thought it was to be traced to his late disputes with the English Benedictine monks, with whom the nuns, as belonging to the same order, had a fellow-feeling; and that it was for this reason that some were opposed to Rev. T. Burgess and others in his favour. Bishop Baines thought that the best way to meet the difficulty was to remove both priests and appoint a new chaplain. But he found that he was only at the beginning of his difficulties. The Prioress pleaded an old privilege which they had been granted when in Paris before the Revolution of nominating their own confessor at least to the extent of presenting three names from whom one was to be chosen. They had never indeed claimed this privilege since they had been in England, but she contended that she had the power to claim it. Dr. Baines at first refused to recognise it at all, but afterwards he allowed the nuns to present three names. But the difference of the present circumstances from those of the previous state in Paris became at once apparent; in Paris there was no lack of priests who

[1] *Catholic Magazine*, February 1833, p. 163.



Cardinal Weld

were willing to accept such a post, but the three named on this occasion all refused to serve. This was the beginning of a long trouble between the Prioress and the Bishop. Dr. Baines seems to have acted, to say the least, unsympathetically, and with a high hand; and eventually the Prioress appealed to Rome for protection. She also wrote to Cardinal Weld, who was acquainted with the community. He occupied at that time a position of great influence in Rome. His antecedents are well known—the fact of his having spent the early part of his life as an English country squire, with a wife and daughter, so that when as a widower he became a priest, and was raised by Pius VIII. to the Roman purple, he was popularly known as the "Cardinal of the Seven Sacraments," for in the end he received them all. At this time he was living in Cardinalitial state in his rooms in the Odescalchi Palace, which became a centre for English society in Rome. His sterling character and the capacity for governing which his experience had given him became known to the reigning Pontiff, and this together with his high family connections gave him a position of unusual influence in the Pope's counsels, especially on matters connected with England.

In the present case it would appear that Cardinal Weld considered that Dr. Baines was acting in too high-handed a manner, and various directions were sent to him, which however he was slow to carry out. Dr. Bramston wrote to him more than once, begging him to do as he had been instructed. "The Religious are in a dreadful state of agitation," he wrote; "for God's sake put an end to it in the way His Holiness directs and without any more delay." As, however, nothing came of these repeated requests, in the summer of 1833 the Pope took the strong measure of withdrawing the community from Dr. Baines, and taking it under his own direct jurisdiction. He then appointed Cardinal Weld his Vicar to deal with the matter, and the Cardinal forthwith re-installed Abbé Prémord.

Dr. Baines felt acutely the indignity consequent on this action. He wrote to Dr. Wiseman on September 4, 1833, complaining bitterly of what had been done.

"I need not, my dear Dr. Wiseman, describe to you the

dreadful suffering this sad affair has caused me," he wrote.[1] "You are aware in what a position it places me. The dispute may be said to have been laid before the Catholic body in England, and the complaints of the nuns against me in the usual exaggerated and distorted form, with a thousand additions made by frivolity, rash judgment and hostile feeling are publicly known. I have preserved an almost entire silence hoping that the decision of the Holy See rejecting the application of the nuns to be removed from my *tyranny*, and obliging these refractory ladies to return to obedience would be a sufficient justification of my conduct. The decision which has taken place not only confirms in the public mind the false accusations that have been made against me, but coupled with the former accusations of the monks, the truth of which was in like manner confirmed by decisions of the Apostolic See, renders me an object of general pity or contempt, and reduces my authority over any subjects who choose to resist it to a mere name. Indeed I could not in justice to myself enter into any further contest with anyone. The affair is already known all over the kingdom."

Yet one other dispute in which Bishop Baines was engaged must be briefly mentioned. This was the ownership of the church at Trenchard Street, Bristol. It had been built by the exertions of Rev. Robert Plowden, an ex-Jesuit, who remained there till the year 1815, when he left under somewhat unusual circumstances.[2] After his departure the church was still served for a time by the Fathers. Latterly, however, it had been served by a Secular priest. When the restoration of the Jesuits was formally recognised in 1829, they wished to recover the church; yet curiously, Dr. Baines, who had taken a chief part in bringing about the restoration, was unwilling to allow their claim to the Bristol mission.

With all these questions pending, and after two failures to adjust matters between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines, and indeed another dispute having already arisen,[3] it does not surprise us to find the Bishop on his way to Rome early in the year 1834. He arrived on February 27. At

[1] *Clifton Archives.* [2] See *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, ii., p. 68.

[3] With Dom Jerome Jenkins, the new priest of Bath, which coming on the top of the other Bath disputes, caused considerable stir.

first he seemed likely to be successful, his old influence and his winning manner being as usual strong assets in his favour. In the end, however, at a Congregation on May 12, a somewhat elaborate board of Arbitration was arranged for, to decide on all points in dispute between him and the Benedictines. The Bishop was to nominate two, the Monks two, and the four so named were to co-opt a fifth. At the same Congregation, Dr. Baines's request to have Dr. Wiseman as his Coadjutor was discussed, and it was "dilata" or postponed. The reason commonly given was that Dr. Wiseman was considered too young to be a Bishop, and Dr. Baines too young to need a Coadjutor.[1] It would seem, however, that there was a further reason behind the decision. Dr. Baines was at that moment engaged in a serious dispute against the Benedictine body, and he had likewise had difficulties with the Jesuits. He had earned the reputation of being an enemy to the Regulars; and, whereas his district had always been governed by a Bishop from the Regular clergy, he was now for the first time asking for a Secular to be promoted to the position. It was considered, therefore, that it would be better at least to wait until his disputes with the Regulars were settled before appointing a Coadjutor from the Secular clergy.

Dr. Baines left Rome at the end of August and, after a leisurely journey, reached England in November. He was received with acclamation at Prior Park, where the students assembled to meet him and read an address of welcome. Preparations were now made for the Arbitration. Dr. Baines nominated Dr. Briggs, Coadjutor Bishop of the Northern District, and Dr. Youens, ex-President of Ushaw. The Benedictines chose Bishop Walsh and Rev. Charles Brooke, the Jesuit Provincial. These four met and chose a fifth member from Scotland—Bishop Scott, Vicar Apostolic of the

[1] See letter of Rev. J. Bonomi (*Clifton Archives*) published in the *Ampleforth Journal*, May, 1910, p. 283.

Since the above was written, a letter from Cardinal Weld to Rev. T. J. Brown has been met with in the *Downside Archives*, in which the following words occur:—

"His Lordship also, very unwisely, I think, made a petition for a Coadjutor, and a *wise* one, the answer to which was *Dilata*, simply without comment. His Lordship seems to be considered the determined foe of the Regulars, and this was a bold push to get rid of them as Bishops of the West."

Western District—who would naturally be quite outside either party to the dispute.

The formal inquiry began on July 9, 1835, at the new mission of Clifton, this being presumably the nearest "neutral ground". The following synopsis of their proceedings was given by Dom Joseph Brown in a letter to Cardinal Weld in August, 1835:—[1]

"On the 9th of July . . . the Arbiters met for the purpose of making their arrangements. The plan resolved on was to have both the contending parties present at the same time, to receive documents from both sides, and to allow the complainants to make a verbal reply to the documents put in by the defendants. On the 11th the affairs of Ampleforth were begun and occupied us until the 24th inclusively. On the 27th and following days the various other complaints on both sides were stated and considered, and the evidence of each party was closed late on the 1st of August. Since then the Arbiters have been closely employed in considering privately first, and afterwards together, the matters submitted to them, and in forming their judgment."

The findings of the Arbiters were issued on August 22, 1835. With respect to the disputes which we have been following, it may be said in general terms that the decision on the question of the Bath mission was in favour of the Benedictines, confirming their contention that the church was their property; but on the Ampleforth question, with some small exceptions, it was in favour of the three Superiors and the Bishop. Indeed, Dr. Baines's answers were so complete, that on seeing them the Benedictines withdrew fourteen out of their twenty-four "complaints," which accordingly never came before the Arbiters at all. On the remaining ten the awards were substantially in favour of the Bishop, with the exceptions mentioned below.[2]

[1] *Downside Archives.*

[2] See the list of complaints and the awards of the Arbiters, in the handwriting of Bishop Briggs, at the Bishop's House, Leeds, whither the letters and papers of the old Northern District were eventually transferred from York. The following is the text of the letter abandoning the fourteen complaints:—

"The Representatives of the English Benedictines beg leave to lay before the Right Reverend and Reverend Arbiters the following schedule of those

The following documents, which were printed and circulated, tell their own tale :—

"Towards the close of the investigation held by the five Arbiters at Clifton, the Benedictines being requested to state how far the explanations and accountings given by the opposite party appeared satisfactory to them, they delivered in the following document :—

"'To the Right Reverend and Reverend Arbiters. We the undersigned for ourselves and our brethren being called upon at the approaching conclusion of this investigation to say in what degree the explanations given by the opposite side have been satisfactory to us, in those cases whereof the property of Ampleforth was the subject, and for which an accounting was requisite, beg to state that in consequence of the explanations given, by which the obscurity in which those matters were enveloped has been removed, we fully acquit the three retiring members of our body, and as far as the Right Reverend Dr. Baines may have been considered to be connected with them, him also, of all intentional injustice in respect of property and goods belonging to the said house, and we are also desirous not to let pass the present opportunity of expressing our regret at any harshness of terms, or severity of animadversion which may have been employed in the course of these proceedings.

"'J. A. BIRDSALL,
"'T. J. BROWN.

"'CLIFTON, *August* 17, 1835.'

"The above did not satisfy Dr. Baines and his party. Dr. Baines submitted in conciliatory terms to the Arbiters that even unintentional injustice is injustice, and pressed hard that a more explicit declaration of acquittal to him and to his party should be given. But as the above declaration had been considered by the Arbiters to be sufficiently ample, the Benedictines were unwilling to give any other.

"To get over the difficulty, the Arbiters, having consulted among themselves, gave to each party in writing the two following documents :—

portions of their complaints which, now that explanations have taken place, they are willing to abandon, not considering it any longer necessary that they may be made matter of further investigation.

"(Here follows the list of the fourteen complaints abandoned).

"(Signed) J. A. BIRDSALL, *President-General*."

"'It appears to the Arbiters that no part of the property of the Monastery of Ampleforth was taken away by Rev. Messrs. Burgess, Metcalfe, and Rooker, nor received by Dr. Baines, except a picture of St. Jerome, which was removed under an erroneous impression that it had been given to Mr. Burgess; and a sum of about £150, which was taken through an unintentional error; which error having been discovered by Mr. Burgess during the course of this enquiry, that sum has been repaid by him. Of these mistakes Dr. Baines could not have had any knowledge.

"'The Arbitrators further add in general terms that in the course of their enquiries they have not met with anything to impeach the characters of either Dr. Baines, or Messrs. Burgess, Metcalfe, and Rooker.

"' + THOMAS WALSH, V.A.
"' + ANDREW SCOTT, V.A.
"' + JOHN BRIGGS, V.A.
"' THOMAS YOUENS.
"' CH. BROOKE.'

"CLIFTON, 22*nd August*, 1835.

"'Although the Arbitrators have declared their opinion that nothing has appeared in the course of their investigation to impeach the characters of the Right Rev. Dr. Baines, or of Messrs. Burgess, Rooker, and Metcalfe, yet as there were matters which required explanation, they are not of opinion that the charges brought against his Lordship and those gentlemen were such as to impeach the character of the accusers.

"' + THOMAS WALSH, V.A.
"' + ANDREW SCOTT, V.A.
"' + JOHN BRIGGS, V.A.
"' THOMAS YOUENS.
"' CH. BROOKE.'"

It remains to add that the Arbiters and the parties concerned—the Benedictine representatives, Revv. J. Birdsall, R. Marsh, T. Robinson, E. Glover, and T. J. Brown; the Bishop and the three former Superiors of Ampleforth, and the Arbiters themselves—all dined together first at Prior Park, and the following day at Downside, as an earnest of peace having been made; and they then dispersed.

The award as to the Bath mission was confirmed by Rome by a decree dated November 23, 1835, and the other awards by a decree dated December 10. The question as to the Bristol church formed the subject of negotiation between Dr. Baines and the General of the Jesuits in Rome and afterwards, and was not settled till after the Bishop's death; but the church was eventually handed over to the Society. The dispute with the Cannington nuns also did not form part of the arbitration; it was practically settled by the Community leaving Dr. Baines's District, and settling under the care of Dr. Walsh at Colwich, in Staffordshire, where they now are. In like manner the Rev. John Birdsall removed in 1834 to Broadway, an offshoot of the mission of Cheltenham, across the border of Worcestershire, and therefore in the Midland District. There he died three years later, on August 2, 1837.

CHAPTER IV.

EARLY AGITATION FOR A HIERARCHY.

It has already been mentioned that as soon as the excitement connected with the actual passing of the Emancipation Act had died down, an agitation for a restoration of the hierarchy showed itself among both clergy and laity, and from about 1833 it was made the subject of articles in the *Catholic Magazine* and elsewhere. For a while the Vicars Apostolic held aloof, and allowed the discussion to proceed independently of them. This gave the impression that they were not interested in the matter, and their apathy was considered to be one of the chief obstacles to its attainment. We get evidence of the public feeling in this direction in the following words used by the editors of the *Catholic Magazine* at the end of the year 1834 :—[1]

"Unfortunately," they write, "this island once lost its hierarchy, and notwithstanding the universal aspirations of the second order of the clergy, it is to be feared that measures are not yet contemplated for its restoration. It may be well indeed to intimate to those whom it may seem to concern more immediately that the clergy are becoming restless upon this subject; that their wishes which lately were but whispered, are now spoken; that a movement strong but orderly is daily making progress, and that nothing can repress it but the just concession of that ecclesiastical government which only is recognised by the spirit and genius of the Christian religion. We go further, and inform those whom no one else will inform that events have recently taken place which must, by their consequences, eventually accelerate this so much desired consummation."

In reality, the Vicars Apostolic were fully alive to the fact that the question was in the air, but before taking action they

[1] See the number for January, 1835, p. 3.

awaited some instruction from Rome; and when it was indicated by Propaganda that the question was to be considered by them, the progress of the negotiations was impeded by a series of unfortunate misunderstandings which had the effect of considerably retarding the wished-for result.

It is probable that some at least of these misunderstandings might have been avoided if Dr. Gradwell had lived. It seemed indeed—as already stated—that he had an important work before him in using his Roman experience in order to bring the Vicars Apostolic into closer touch with the Holy See; but all the hopes which had been founded on him were cut short by his unexpected and premature death. His eleven years' residence in Rome had enfeebled his constitution, at no time strong, and the return to the cold, damp English climate was more than he was able to stand. In the autumn of 1832 his health was already visibly failing, and when at the beginning of the following year dropsy set in, it became evident that the end was at hand. On January 25, 1833, Bishop Bramston wrote to Dr. Wiseman: "Poor Dr. Gradwell has not been out of the house during the last six weeks. The swelling of his limbs and body increases, but he suffers little or no pain, and his spirits are very good. His physicians give but very faint hopes of his recovery."[1] He received the last rites at the beginning of February, and although for a time there was an improvement, and he even hoped that he might become well enough to go away for a change of air, it was all along evident to his attendants that the amendment would not prove permanent. His twin brother[2] and his sister were summoned to his bedside. Soon there was a relapse, and he realised that he had not long to live. The following details of his last days are from a letter written by a friend, apparently Dr. Bramston:—[3]

"From the moment that he expressed his conviction of the moral impossibility of his recovery, his composure, which had never failed, seemed every instant more perfect and more elevated by real piety. Faith, Hope, and Charity appeared to possess his whole soul. I gave him the last benediction at

[1] *Archives of the English College, Rome.*
[2] A layman, living at Preston.
[3] *Catholic Magazine*, April, 1833, p. 332.

his own desire early in the morning of Sunday the 10th [March]. He then conceived himself to be dying. I had the same conception, and although from that moment neither his physician, his good brother and sister, nor any of us could expect him to survive many minutes, he did live in the same posture in his chair (for he could not lie down) until the morning of the 15th instant, and died immediately after midnight. He had not the slightest convulsion before death, so that he breathed his last almost imperceptibly; and to his last breath was endeavouring to pronounce the Holy Name."

The funeral took place at Moorfields on March 27. The Mass was celebrated by the aged Bishop Bramston, and the sermon was preached by the Rev. Thomas Griffiths, President of St. Edmund's College. Though Dr. Gradwell was never directly connected with St. Edmund's,—he was educated at Douay and Crook Hall—the fact that he was Coadjutor of the London District made it appropriate that when the church at Moorfields was pulled down in 1899, his body should be removed there with the others, and it was interred under the cloister adjoining the College Chapel. Above it stands a mural slab, formerly at Moorfields, on which is commemorated the virtues and good qualities of one whose future promised so much, and who had already endeared himself to the Catholics of the London District, and seemed to be but beginning his new career, when the summons came to him to leave this world. But the work for which he will always remain famous was the successful re-organisation of the English College at Rome, which he carried out in the midst of many difficulties with such remarkable success; and to-day when we see the *Collegium Venerabile* at the zenith of its prosperity, we should not easily forget the work of him who rendered its subsequent success possible.

It was of course evident that Dr. Bramston would require a new Coadjutor immediately, and in fact less than six months after the death of Dr. Gradwell, it was formally announced that his successor would be Dr. Griffiths. The appointment had been expected as a matter of course. Five years earlier his name had been set aside on the ground of his youth. The time which had since elapsed went far to remove this defect, and considering his position, and his known intimacy with

Dr. Bramston, his choice seemed almost certain. He had, moreover, many qualifications for the post. His holiness of life was well known, and he was greatly revered by the clergy of the District, many of whom had been under him at St. Edmund's College. All those who came into close contact with him speak of the remarkable influence which he exercised over his pupils. He was also a careful and experienced administrator. His election to the responsible post of President of St. Edmund's at the early age of twenty-six is evidence of the confidence of his episcopal superior, Dr. Poynter, a confidence which he fully justified by the prudent manner in which he ruled the College, and his success in clearing it of the large debts with which it had been burdened.

Although, however, Dr. Griffiths was well known for personal holiness of life, there were those who thought him not well qualified for his new position on account of his want of experience of the world, and the narrowness of outlook which necessarily followed from his personal history. He was the first Bishop in England in modern times whose education had taken place entirely in his own country, and indeed he had never lived outside the walls of St. Edmund's College. In those days such a life was one of complete seclusion from the world, and many thought it an insufficient preparation for so public a position as that of Bishop of the London District. Such proved in great measure the case. Dr. Griffiths was scrupulously exact in discharging his episcopal duties, which in fact he felt as a continual burden on his conscience, and there was a strong bond of mutual confidence between himself and his clergy.[1] But in his communications with Rome, he did not show that wisdom or forethought which would have been looked for in one whose position made him practically the leader of English Catholics. He was indeed ever punctual in dealing with all business referred to him by the Holy See, and ready to give information about whatever subject; but he was not always tactful in his manner of expression, and contrived to give offence more than once. Moreover, once he had made up his mind on any matter, nothing would induce him to deviate by a hair's-breadth from the position he had taken up.

[1] With one or two exceptions. The Rev. John Jones of Warwick Street had for many years been an opponent of his, and continued to be so to the end.

His intractability was so marked that he was at times compared to Bishop Baines. There was, however, this most essential difference between them, that whereas Bishop Baines was always slow to give way, even after an adverse decision had been given, in the case of Bishop Griffiths this was not so. As long as any responsibility rested with him, he was inflexible; but no sooner had a definite decision been come to against him than his holiness at once came to his aid, and he gave way immediately. He was not even at pains to discover any way of submitting without appearing to have been overruled; on the contrary, he simply gave out that "owing to letters received from Rome," he revoked his former decision.

There was also a further reason why some people objected to the appointment of Dr. Griffiths, which was to be found in the method of his nomination. Once more the reigning Vicar Apostolic had chosen his successor without the clergy or people having any voice in his election. This manner of procedure had no doubt been almost a necessity in penal times, when there was no possibility of carrying out a more systematic method, and when at the same time it was of great importance that there should be no prolonged period of vacancy. But by the year 1833 these considerations had ceased to have any weight. There would have been no practical difficulty in carrying out any desired system of election, and in point of fact the necessity of establishing some such system was one of the chief considerations urged by those who were calling out for the restoration of the hierarchy.

The following account of the announcement of Dr. Griffiths's appointment, taken from a letter from the Rev. John Jones of Warwick Street to Dr. Lingard, dated September 29, 1833, indicates what many were thinking:—[1]

"Bishop Bramston is an infirm man, whose life at best is not worth six months' purchase, and he has nominated a successor who will, we conceive, be as ready to propagate the system of private nomination to the Apostolic Vicariate as he is to take it up on that principle from Dr. Bramston.

"This day week, at St. Edmund's College, immediately after the removal of the dinner cloth, Dr. Griffiths was for-

[1] Ushaw Collections.



Bishop Griffiths

mally announced as Bishop of Olena. Bishop Bramston prefaced his announcement by assuring the company that it gave him more pleasure than he had ever heretofore enjoyed to inform them that his Holiness had graciously yielded to his request for his excellent friend at his left as his Coadjutor, that the bulls had arrived, and that nothing was wanting but consecration, which was to be performed as soon as possible, and that Dr. Griffiths was already Bishop inasmuch as he could not set aside the appointment. He therefore called upon the company (consisting of twelve priests, seven of whom were ordained on the preceding Sunday, and five Professors, and a Protestant relation of his, Mr. Yorke, who sat at his right) to drink the health of the new Bishop. Some tears of tenderness and congratulation were shed by the speaker, a partial applause followed the address, and the toast was drank with three times three, with the subsequent intonation of *Ad multos annos*. The elect, much abashed and embarrassed, rose and returned thanks, and adroitly applying the words that had been just chanted, expressed a hope that his Coadjutorship would last many years."

In answer to this letter, Dr. Lingard wrote as follows :—[1]

"I feel with you on the subject of your letter, and as heartily disapprove of our present ecclesiastical polity. The Bishops dispose of the succession as though they held their offices in fee simple, and had a right to leave them to whom they please. But while I admit the abuse, I know not where to discover a remedy which may not prove a worse evil. . . . To the appointment of Dr. Griffiths in particular, I know not with what face I can object. I do not reside in the diocese, nor am I at all acquainted with him. Of his qualifications for the office, or his disqualification, I am totally ignorant. To the prevailing method of appointment in general I would object, did I know to whom to transfer it. Would you rest it in our Chapter?[2] That could never be accomplished. We should have the court of Rome, the English Bishops, and the great body of the English clergy against us. In the missionaries at large? This would lead to parties, dissensions and

[1] Ushaw Collections.

[2] *I.e.* the General Chapter of England : see *Dawn of the Catholic Revival*, ii., p. 31.

appeals to Rome, such as are carried there from Ireland in almost every vacancy; and such appeals would probably suggest the appointment of a Protector for the mission who would be Cardinal Weld under the superintendence of the Jesuits.

"I have sometimes thought that the only possible expedient for raising the clergy from their present degraded state would be the erection of a Chapter, say of twelve members in each vicariate, which Chapter should exercise jurisdiction *vacante episcopatu*, and have the right of presenting three names to the choice of the Pope whenever a Bishop or Coadjutor is to be appointed. This would be a first step of importance, as it would not only produce the benefit for which it would be ostensibly established, but also give existence to an acknowledged authority which on proper occasions might check the irresponsible and unlimited authority of the Bishop."

The correspondence continued for some little time; but it was evidently premature to raise the question at that date, and the grievance complained of was not remedied until the hierarchy actually came into existence.

Dr. Griffiths received his episcopal consecration at the hands of Bishop Bramston, at St. Edmund's College, on the Feast of Sts. Simon and Jude, October 28, 1833. The assisting Bishops were Dr. Walsh and Dr. Penswick, and the sermon was preached by Dr. Baines. Apparently some reaction had set in against the exceedingly long ceremonies which had become customary, for Rev. Thomas Doyle of St. George's Fields writes in the *Catholic Magazine* as follows:— [1]

"Dr. Baines preached a very excellent and appropriate sermon,—yet—rather too long. His Lordship will pardon us, but insensibly to himself, he is becoming too lengthy. The ceremony began at about ten in the morning, and lasted until nearly three in the afternoon, that is to say, five hours! We hope in pity to the weaker brethren that the next consecration may be shortened by two hours at least. The music was very respectable; some parts were excellent, but the old fault, it was too long, too long, a great deal too long, long to weariness, to vexation."

He concludes with an aspiration which is worth recording

[1] December, 1833, p. 289.

as showing the ideas already in his mind, which led to the erection of St. George's Cathedral some years later.

"The whole Function was very well arranged," he writes, "very imposing, extremely interesting and edifying. Nothing was wanting to give the very splendid ceremonial its proper effect excepting—room. If such a *cortège* as we witnessed at the Consecration—mitred Bishops in scarlet, gold and lace, train bearers, surpliced priests, two and two, croziers, lights, clouds of incense, etc., etc., all in slow procession—could have been translated to Westminster Abbey, and moving slowly up its nave to the solemn sound of the organ now there, all would have been perfect; but the splendid throng wanted room to show itself to advantage. For the due exhibition of our religious rites we want space; not chapels of fifty by twenty, but the dimensions of the long, lengthened and lofty cathedral. May the day yet come when these things shall be!"

One of the first questions which arose during the episcopate of the new Coadjutor concerned the old topic of the relations between the Secular and Regular clergy. It arose from the fact that the Jesuits, having recently secured the formal recognition of the Society as re-established in England, were naturally anxious to secure a mission in London. They had indeed always had an "agent" from their own body resident in London, who attended to their interests, and also exercised faculties in an informal way; but they thought that the time had now come for them to have a regular chapel under their administration. This involved the permission of the Vicar Apostolic, and they rightly supposed that he would object to dividing up any of the existing missions in order to allow them to come in, as this would interfere with the proper support of the clergy already in charge, who were far from well off. The Jesuits might indeed have contended that what was really required was more vigour and enterprise, that there was capability for expansion in London, and that in the long run the other missions would not suffer. But they realised that it would have been fruitless to urge this at the moment, and they preferred to await some opportunity when a new mission might be called for which they could undertake.

Such an opportunity seemed to present itself in 1833 when a new church was about to be built at St. John's Wood, by the munificence of two maiden ladies, the Misses Gallini, who wished before they died to spend their money for the good of religion. At that time St. John's Wood was almost in the country, but there was every prospect of London spreading in that direction, and of its becoming a fashionable neighbourhood. Dr. Bramston afterwards stated that he "distinctly understood"[1] both from the Misses Gallini, at the first and only interview which he had with them, in the summer of 1833, and afterwards from Mr. Stapleton, their lawyer, that it was to be served by the secular clergy, and he accordingly consented to become trustee. The Misses Gallini themselves, however, were attached to the Fathers, and their first idea was that it should be served jointly by Seculars and Jesuits. It was not unusual in those days for Secular and Regular chaplains to work side by side in the same church. A notable instance may be mentioned at the Portuguese church in South Street, which was the one which the Misses Gallini themselves attended. The chief chaplain for many years was Mgr. Fryer; but among the assistant chaplains up to 1830 was the Rev. W. Placid Morris, O.S.B., afterwards Bishop. It was proposed to carry out a similar arrangement at St. John's Wood; but when the Misses Gallini learnt that this would not be possible, they consented to request that the Jesuits should have sole charge of the mission. The fact that the Fathers had for some years past been conducting a day school in that neighbourhood caused them to be well known there, so that it was natural that their friends should wish to see them established in the new mission. Mr. Stapleton, therefore, on behalf of the donors, informed Dr. Bramston of their wish.

The Bishop, however, was resolutely opposed to the arrangement, feeling that he had secular priests at his command who were well qualified to undertake the work, and realising that St. John's Wood was likely to become an important mission in the future. He was probably confirmed in this determination by the advice of his new Coadjutor, Dr. Griffiths, who seems to have inherited the feeling in this respect of his former master, Dr. Poynter. As however Dr. Bram-

[1] "Plane intellexi."

ston thought it undesirable to discuss such matters with a layman, he contented himself with saying that he would give the matter his consideration.

As time went on and no answer was received, the Jesuits thought it advisable to bring their forces to bear. They accordingly communicated with their Roman agent, Father Glover, who brought the matter before Cardinal Weld. The latter readily consented to use his influence on their behalf, and he wrote to Dr. Bramston in this sense. Dr. Bramston, however, was not willing to give way, and he wrote to Dr. Wiseman for advice; and Dr. Wiseman in turn consulted Dr. Baines, who was then in Rome, engaged on his own troubles with the Benedictines. The following long letter from him to Dr. Griffiths is sufficiently instructive to warrant our quoting it in full. In the first paragraph we see the conflicting emotions in his mind. Five years before he had been the advocate of the Jesuits, on the matter of their recognition in England, as against what he believed to be Dr. Bramston's view, and he had gained his point. Now he unexpectedly found himself fighting side by side with that Bishop on a question concerned with the Fathers; while curiously in the disputes between Dr. Baines and the Benedictines, Dr. Bramston had shown himself inclined to the side of the Regulars. The following is the text of the letter:—[1]

"38 Piazza Nicosia, Rome,
"*May 10th*, 1834.

"My dear Lord,

"Dr. Wiseman has this moment showed me a letter from Dr. Bramston enclosing a copy of one to his Lordship from Cardinal Weld. He was anxious I should write to Dr. Bramston to press upon him the necessity of employing in this affair the joint influence of the episcopal body, without which he is persuaded that Miss Gallini and friends will carry their point. I am quite of the same opinion, considering the powerful confederacy and the able generalship employed against you. It is quite evident that the Jesuits have a majority in the Sacred Congregation, which majority Mgr. Mai commands and regulates at pleasure. He has also the ear of the Pope, who is himself on the Regular side. Dr. Bramston's influence,

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

personally, as far as I can judge, is completely gone. A single paragraph in a late *ponenza*, insinuating his hostility to the Jesuits, because there are only three Jesuits in London, and because he hesitated to give up the new Chapel to the Society, has withered his reputation here as completely as a powerful stroke of lightning withers the sturdiest oak, and has withered it, I strongly suspect, just as irremediably. Though I cannot help thinking this a fair retribution, it really gives me pain to hear how differently he is spoken of now from what he was some time ago. His Lordship may imagine that his two last letters are very clever. So they are; but still they will have no effect but to confirm the persuasion already existing and lessen if possible his influence. His charges of intrigue against the Society will, I can assure him, be ill received, and it will be said of him by Cardinal Weld, if not to him, as was once on a similar occasion said to me, 'These are heavy charges indeed, and your Lordship must excuse me if I do not receive them on your mere assertion'.

"In short, my conviction is that the Jesuits will carry their point. Should the blow be delayed out of a feeling of delicacy on the part of his Eminence for Dr. Bramston, which I much doubt, it will fall upon you the moment he is removed.

"But why do I write these unpleasant things to you, and not to Dr. Bramston himself? First, because I am anxious to persuade myself that my opinions may possess more weight with your Lordship than they do with my aged friend. Secondly, because I will admit to you that I feel aggrieved at the conduct that Dr. Bramston has pursued in my regard, during the course of my disputes with the Regulars. Repeatedly have I requested and implored him to assist me, so far at least as to contradict the assertion made by Cardinal de Gregorio in his Holiness's hearing, that he understood that all the Bishops were against me. The other Bishops would have done this and more at our last meeting, but were prevented by Dr. Bramston's opposition and unwillingness. The only expression of his sentiments which I could draw from him was in a letter which he gave me to read and carry to Dr. Wiseman when I came hither, which Dr. Wiseman agreed with me could not be shown, as it would confirm the persuasion that the Bishops were against me, not remove it.

"But another circumstance has occurred which causes me to feel still more fully the untowardness of Dr. Bramston's conduct. In a long interview I lately had with his Holiness, in which I complained of having been condemned without so much as knowing the charges brought against me, the Pope expressed his surprise, and said that he had himself caused to be printed at Propaganda the *Documenti estratti dalle Ponenze* of 1830, containing those charges, and sent them to the Vicars Apostolic, with an express commission that they should enquire into their truth, and report to the Sacred Congregation. Not receiving any answer, said his Holiness, and never doubting that the commission had been executed, I concluded that the Bishops had found the charges grounded, and not liking to condemn a brother Bishop, remained silent. This persuasion, his Holiness assured me, had guided his proceedings in my regard. I could only say that I did not believe that such were the feelings of the Bishops.

"I appeal to yourself, whether under these circumstances it would be more than an act of justice to disabuse his Holiness on this head, if his conclusions were incorrect? Should any document from the Bishops be sent, stating openly their opinions respecting the Regulars as connected with the Bishops, I hope that it will contain some clause in my defence. This would be of some service to me, but it would be of still greater to the Bishops in general, by checking that triumphant attack which my defeat has enabled my opponents to direct against the body to which I belong. I should be glad to hear from you on these subjects with as little delay and as much detail as possible, and in hopes of so doing, I will protract my stay for a short time. If the Vicars Apostolic were united, they would carry every point that is just; if they continue as little united as we have hitherto been, we shall fall one by one.

"Believe me, dear Dr. Griffiths,

"Your Lordship's most obedient and faithful servant,

"+ P. BAINES."

At first it appeared as though this forecast of Bishop Baines would be verified; for the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining from Propaganda a request in the sense they wished. This was made known to Dr. Bramston by Cardinal Pedecini,

Prefect of Propaganda, in a letter dated July 19, 1834. The following is a translation of the important paragraphs of his letter :—[1]

"It would be very acceptable to the Sacred Congregation if this church could be opened as soon as possible, so that it may at once serve the convenience of the Faithful. The Sacred Congregation is aware that the sisters, the Misses Gallini, intend that the church in question shall be handed over to the Fathers of the Society of Jesus. It is indeed manifest that this would be very profitable, nor can there be any doubt that the Fathers of the Society of Jesus would show every care that the offices of the sacred ministry should be carried out there, to the great good of souls, and to the increase of Religion.

"It has been reported to the Sacred Congregation that your Lordship has been asked by the Misses Gallini to empower them to hand over the church to the Jesuit Fathers, and that all proper arrangements being made, it should be opened ; but so far, your Lordship has not replied. But the Sacred Congregation is sure that your Lordship having nothing in view but the increase of the Church and the profit of the Faithful will set aside any possible hesitation in this matter, and grant the request which is sought."

Dr. Bramston answered this letter on August 8, 1834, by a spirited declaration that he could not "without inflicting a grievous wound on his conscience" give his approbation to the scheme. He gave as his reason that he had plenty of priests of his own, and that the presence of Regulars would undoubtedly lead to disputes and difficulties, as had always been the case in England in the past. For this reason he begged Propaganda to request the Jesuits to refuse the offer of the Misses Gallini.

At the same time, in accordance with Dr. Baines's advice, the Vicars Apostolic prepared a joint letter of protest, which they addressed to the Holy Father personally. The letter was written by Lingard. In it they did not limit themselves to the case of St. John's Wood. They complained of certain proposed foundations on the part of the Benedictines in the Northern District of which Dr. Penswick disapproved ; and they likewise alluded to the dispute between Bishop Baines

[1] *Westminster Archives.* See Appendix D.

and the Cannington nuns, concluding with a request that the *Regula Missionis* should not be infringed without an opportunity being first given to the Bishops to express their opinion. The letter was signed by all the Vicars Apostolic of England and Scotland with the single exception of Dr. Walsh. His relations with the Regulars had always been cordial, and he was unwilling to take any part in what might be considered an act of hostility towards them. The letter was kept back until the return of Dr. Baines from Rome, so that he might be able to add his signature to the others; it was eventually dated December 10, 1834, but did not reach his Holiness till several weeks later.

The Pope answered with a long letter dated June 20, 1835,[1] a copy of which he sent to all the Vicars Apostolic, in which he complained bitterly of the ungracious tone of their joint letter, and answered all the points raised by them, in order to show that Propaganda had acted constitutionally, and had not infringed the bull *Apostolicae Missionis*. He also warned them, with respect to St. John's Wood, that what Propaganda had hitherto expressed as a wish, might be repeated as a command.

Nevertheless, the matter of St. John's Wood in the event was not pressed further. This was probably in part due to the retirement of Cardinal Pedecini from the office of Prefect of Propaganda, in which he had been continuing temporarily until the appointment of his successor. Dr. Baines had always regarded him as the main instigator of the policy in favour of the Regulars. "Lord Clifford spoke to Cardinal Weld," he wrote,[2] "of the inevitable ruin to religion which must result from [Cardinal Pedecini's] policy as exemplified in my case, and in that of the Gallini Chapel, which certainly made a great impression . . . and elicited observations I had long wished to hear made as to the necessity of the religious acting with good faith, and as auxiliaries to the Bishops, and in subordination to them."

The new Prefect of Propaganda was Cardinal Fransoni, a member of a noble Genoese family, who was destined to have a long term of office, and to be closely associated with English affairs. What precise view he took of the St. John's Wood

[1] *Southwark Archives*, and elsewhere.
[2] *Archives of English College, Rome.*

case does not appear. It would seem that the Jesuits refrained from pressing matters to extremes; at any rate, in point of fact, the church remained in the hands of Dr. Bramston, who appointed the Rev. James O'Neal—Cardinal Manning's future Vicar General—to take charge of it; and it was opened early in the following year (1836). In this result, therefore, Dr. Bramston had reason to congratulate himself. Moreover, Dr. Penswick was informed by the Pope in the letter alluded to above that the rumour of the Benedictine foundations in his diocese was entirely groundless—a pure invention,[1]—so that he also had reason to congratulate himself. Unfortunately both he and Dr. Bramston overlooked the obvious fact that such a communication from the Holy Father called at least for a letter of thanks in reply. The other Bishops all sent suitable answers. In the case of Dr. Bramston the omission was probably traceable to his failing health; but it becomes the more remarkable when we remember that during that summer Dr. Wiseman was in London, and a frequent guest at Dr. Bramston's table, so that the whole episode must have often formed a topic of conversation between them.

The events connected with Dr. Wiseman's visit, however, are so important that they demand a separate chapter in which to consider them.

[1] "Commentitium."

CHAPTER V.

DR. WISEMAN'S VISIT TO ENGLAND (1835-36).

THE visit of Dr. Wiseman to England in 1835 was ostensibly undertaken by him primarily for the sake of his health, in order to give himself a year's rest from his routine life in Rome; in reality it had been arranged with Dr. Baines in Rome the previous year, in order to give Dr. Wiseman an opportunity of visiting Prior Park and talking over possible plans for the future; for although the proposal of his becoming Coadjutor had been for the time negatived, it was still hoped that he might take an important part in Dr. Baines's schemes at Prior Park. In the event, however, Wiseman's visit to England led to results of another kind which in truth mark an epoch in English Catholic history, as the starting-point of that great expansion and development which followed during the succeeding years.

He came determined to make himself acquainted with the true state of Catholicity in England. This he had never had the opportunity of doing before; for during his school days he had lived in the seclusion of Ushaw, and immediately afterwards he had left for the English College at Rome where he had resided ever since. The few brief visits which he had paid to England since he had become Rector had not been long enough for him to become familiar with the state of the country, while his Roman surroundings had instilled into him an optimistic estimate of the prospects of Catholicism in this country which he found was not shared by his co-religionists in England. He had himself been much impressed by the visit he had received two years before in Rome, from Newman and Hurrell Froude, and by the account they gave of all that was proceeding within the Anglican Church; yet he found that the Catholics who lived on the spot were

taking little or no notice of what was going on around them. He attributed this state of apathy to the fact that they had not yet awakened to full life after the long oppression of the Penal Laws; but for that very reason he thought it the more important that the requisite stimulus should be given to them to awaken them to a true sense of their position and of the prospects for the future. Before he could hope to influence them it was a first and foremost necessity that he should acquire an accurate first-hand knowledge of the actual state of affairs. Writing nearly twenty years later, he declares that the moment was "critical and interesting".

"Three years before," he writes,[1] "had begun to manifest themselves the germs of that wonderful movement which, originating at Oxford, was destined to pervade and agitate the Anglican establishment, till it should give up many of its most loving sons to the Catholic Church; peculiar circumstances . . . had made me at Rome previously acquainted with the rise and progress of this great religious revolution; and I [was] surprised on visiting England in 1835 to find how little attention it had yet excited among Catholics, though many *Tracts for the Times* had already appeared, and Dr. Whateley had sung out to their writers, *Tendimus in Latium.* It was impossible for anyone to foresee what might be the final results of so new and strange a commotion in the hitherto stagnant element of the State religion. . . . Even in that first bud of the rising power it was impossible for a calm and hopeful eye not to see new signs in the religious firmament, which it became a duty to observe, unless one wished to incur the Divine reproach addressed to those who note not the providential warnings and friendly omens of the spiritual heavens. For Catholics to have overlooked all this, and allowed the wonderful phenomenon to pass by, not turned to any useful purpose, but gazed at till it died out, would have been more than stupidity, it would have been wickedness."

Being filled therefore with thoughts of the future of Catholicity in England, and convinced, as he put it, that "a new era had commenced," Dr. Wiseman arrived in London on July 14, 1835. He appears to have stayed with

[1] *Essays*, Introduction, p. vii.



Henry Bagshawe

his friends, most probably with Mr. Henry Bagshawe,[1] a rising barrister who had been received into the Church two years before by Rev. Edward Norris, at St. Patrick's, Soho. During his stay in London, Dr. Wiseman often visited the house of the Vicars Apostolic in Golden Square, and dined with the Bishops there, as we learn from the entries in the diary of Dr. Griffiths.

During the month of August, Dr. Wiseman proceeded to Prior Park, to visit his friend Dr. Baines, whose hopes for the future of Catholicity in England he warmly shared, in order to discuss the future. He found one important development just beginning. The famous missioner, Dr. Gentili, had recently arrived there, with three of his companions. They were members of the Institute of Charity, which had been founded a few years before by Rosmini, and had not as yet received formal approbation by Rome. A few words explaining the origin of their connection with Bishop Baines will be in place.

The idea of the Fathers of Charity coming to England was not entirely new. Dr. Gentili—a Roman by birth—had indeed for many years felt a longing to work in this country, and had at one time received a definite offer of an opening for this purpose from a gentleman in the Midland District;[2] but for some reason the scheme had fallen through. Later on the aged Cornish baronet-priest Sir Henry Trelawney,[3] who then lived in the North of Italy, invited him to Trelawney Castle, where there was a mission worked from the domestic chapel. Bishop Baines, in whose district it was, gave his consent, and the scheme would probably have been carried into execution but for the death of Sir Henry Trelawney, which occurred at Laveno, on February 25, 1834. By this time, however, Bishop Baines had set his heart on the scheme, declaring that the rules and spirit of the new Institute provided for a greater subservience to the Bishop than was the case with the older Religious Orders, and that he would find them valuable assistants for the work of the mission. On his way back from

[1] Three of Mr. Henry Bagshawe's sons became afterwards well known, one as Bishop of Nottingham, one as a Canon of Southwark and priest at Richmond for some forty years, and one as a County Court Judge.

[2] Mr. Lisle Phillipps, of Grace Dieu, Leicestershire.

[3] For the very remarkable history of this gentleman, see the *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, i., p. 193.

Rome, therefore, in the autumn of 1834, he visited Domo d'Ossola, a small town at the foot of the Alps, where the head house of the Institute was, and boldly invited them to come to him at Prior Park. The invitation was accepted by Rosmini, and as soon as preliminaries had been arranged, Dr. Gentili set out with two companions, Revv. Antonio Rey and Emile Belisy, both Frenchmen. They reached London on June 16, 1835. After spending a few days at the house of Bishop Bramston in Golden Square, they proceeded to Prior Park.

On their arrival, Father Gentili and his companions were welcomed by Bishop Baines, and at his request they set forward for their original destination at Trelawney Castle, where he wished them to begin their work. There, therefore, Dr. Gentili preached his first sermon in England on the Feast of Sts. Peter and Paul, 1835. It was a strange audience to preach to. Half of the Trelawney family were Protestants, and were engaged in a lawsuit to defeat the will of Sir Henry; the other half were converts, and they were joined by the few Catholics of the neighbourhood to listen to the new preacher from Rome. So successful was his preaching that on the subsequent Sundays during his few weeks' stay the congregation was increased by quite a number of Protestants. Dr. Gentili was the only one of the fathers able to preach, or indeed to do any active work, the others being wholly ignorant of the English language, to the study of which indeed they devoted their time.

The beginning of the new scholastic year, in August, 1835, found the fathers duly installed for their new work at Prior Park. Dr. Gentili, besides being the religious superior, was made by Dr. Baines Vice-Regent of the College, Prefect of Studies, Spiritual Father, and President of St. Paul's, or the senior department. His rule was naturally based on Italian rather than English lines, and soon met with criticism and opposition. He failed to understand the very restrained form of piety practised by the English Catholics, and set himself at once to counteract it. He made the boys use their rosaries more publicly than they had been accustomed to do, and continually gave them new medals or *Agnus Deis* or other devotional objects, to wear round their necks, or to treat in a devotional fashion. For a while his zeal and the strength of

his personality prevailed over all opposition, and when in the Lent of 1836 he gave a regular systematic Retreat, with proper discourses, to replace the heavier and drier forms of Retreats with meditations taken from authors such as Bourdaloue, hitherto in vogue, it is said that the effect on the spirituality of the house was very marked. Mgr. Shepherd, who was a boy at the time, has described it as follows :—[1]

"During the Retreat, which was attended by the whole College—professors and students—the rules laid down for the guidance of souls by St. Ignatius were followed—the horarium was drawn up and strict silence was enjoined. With a crucifix on his breast, Dr. Gentili preached several times a day from a platform raised in the Chapel. In those days Retreats of this kind were a novelty; and the rigid discipline enforced gave rise at first to some criticism and murmuring, but soon the energy and effect with which the preacher announced the awful truths of eternity, aided by Divine grace, operated upon the hearts of his hearers, producing great recollection and compunction of spirit. The good results of the Retreat were of a lasting nature. The holy sacraments were more frequently approached by all, and a greater devotion to our Blessed Lady (after Gentili's fervent example) was more sedulously cultivated than heretofore."

All this work was just beginning when Dr. Wiseman came to Prior Park in August, 1835, and he found himself in full sympathy with it. The idea of implanting the Roman type of devotion to replace the dry and formal prayers then prevalent among the English Catholics was wholly congenial to him. Nevertheless, just as everything seemed to open out a hopeful prospect in the West of England, Dr. Baines and Dr. Wiseman fell out, and after the latter's departure Dr. Baines wrote him a letter which caused a final rupture between them, and made the prospects of Dr. Wiseman ever becoming either his Coadjutor or President of Prior Park impossible. The cause of the rupture seems to have been that the Bishop asked Dr. Wiseman to take up his work at Prior Park tentatively, for one year, without resigning his position in Rome, so that if he did not succeed in his new surroundings, he could return to the English College. This was an offer which he naturally

[1] *Reminiscences of Prior Park*, p. 8.

regarded as impossible for him to accept; and his determination was strengthened by the fact that Dr. Baines studiously avoided any reference to the further possibility of Dr. Wiseman becoming his Coadjutor; so that the latter concluded that the Bishop's feelings in his regard had undergone a change. This seemed to put an end to all Dr. Wiseman's hopes, and he felt it as a grievous disappointment. Looking back at that visit after nearly a quarter of a century had passed away, he expresses himself in this sense:—

"As for myself," he writes,[1] "I was devoted to [Dr. Baines] heart and soul, and lost favour at Rome by the manner in which I espoused his cause. I saw in Prior Park the beginning of a new era for Catholic affairs, in education, in literature, in public position, and in many things which now are realities, and then were hopes. How was all this broken off? One cause of our separation is too painful for me to recite; but the decisive one was my unfortunately presuming on what I thought confidence, and offering advice when I thought it would be most useful. This produced such a rebuff as I had never received before, and never have since. It was by letter[2]; but if my answer was preserved among the Bishop's papers, I should not mind all the world seeing it. I closed it by saying what may now seem prophetic, that if anyone should hereafter record his life, I hoped he would not draw his character from his letters."[3]

In the following month (September) therefore we find Dr. Wiseman again in London, having abandoned all his hopes for any future work connected with Prior Park. Turning his

[1] See his letter to Rev. J. Bonomi (*Clifton Archives*), printed in the *Ampleforth Journal* for May, 1910, p. 280.

[2] This letter is still preserved at the English College, Rome, and it is from it that we learn the details of the rupture given above. It was written some weeks later—on November 10, 1835.

[3] In his reply to this letter, the Rev. J. Bonomi writes:—

"I perfectly recollect your coming to the Prior Park in the August of 1835; your leaving again; your visit, if I mistake not, to the Shrewsburys; and what ensued between the Earl, the Bishop, and yourself with reference to your report of Prior Park and of Dr. Baines's proceedings. I know the coolness of the Earl and Countess towards the Bishop dated from that period, and I believe I have heard Dr. B[aines] say that he would not adopt your views, or in some way displeased you then; which was the cause of your giving up any plan you may then have had for the good of the College or of religion in that District."

thoughts in other directions, he next planned a tour through the provinces, in order to visit the principal Catholic families at their country seats, and also to cross over to Ireland.

"My projects are as follows," he wrote[1]; "in a few days . . . I set out on a species of tour, or rather *progress* through England and Ireland, having made a resolution never to sleep in an inn or hostelry the whole way; but I intend to quarter myself upon such of the nobility or gentry of these realms as can sufficiently appreciate such an honour. My first station will be in the neighbourhood of Birmingham and other Midland Cyclopean towns, where I have several short calls to make. Thence I proceed to the princely towers and enchanted gardens of Alton, and so forward to Sir E. Vavasour's. . . ."

While he was on his tour in the Midlands, a wish was expressed that he might remain permanently in England, and Dr. Walsh offered him the post of Coadjutor, provided, of course, that Rome would agree; but the Holy Father considered that the time was not yet ripe for his leaving Rome for good, and the scheme was negatived for the time.

After completing his tour, Dr. Wiseman returned to London, where he arrived towards the end of November; and for some months he did duty at the old Sardinian Chapel in Duke Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, the head chaplain, Dr. Baldacconi, taking the opportunity to visit Italy, his native land. At that time it was still customary at that church to have occasional sermons in Italian, and Dr. Wiseman—whose linguistic accomplishments were second only to those of the celebrated Cardinal Mezzofanti—discharged this duty with remarkable facility and success. But the sermons by which he made himself famous were in English and addressed primarily to Protestant listeners. In this he was following the lead of his former friend Dr. Baines, who had delivered similar courses in the church at Bath some years before. Dr. Wiseman's lectures were delivered on the Sunday afternoons of Advent. From the outset he protested that the sermons were not controversial, that he detested the very word of controversy: that his aim was not argument, but exposition. The English people hated the Catholic Church he said, because they did not know her, and it was his object to explain

[1] See his letter quoted in his *Life*, i., p. 215.

to them what Catholics really believed. His success was phenomenal. Sunday after Sunday the church was filled to overflowing with eager listeners, the majority of whom were Protestants, including in their number several men of eminence.

The success of the lectures was very popular with the Catholics of London. They had been so accustomed to keeping in the background and hiding their heads that the publicity which they had now obtained came almost as a shock to them. They had looked upon mere toleration of their religion as the greatest good they could hope for; now they suddenly found one of their co-religionists boldly standing forth before the great Protestant public proclaiming Catholic doctrine, and every one eager to listen.

Among the clergy, especially the older ones, the feeling of satisfaction was less marked. They recalled the fact that Dr. Wiseman was at that time only thirty-four years of age, and to a great extent ignorant of the conditions of Catholic work in London; yet he was boldly striking out a new line which his elders would have been afraid to venture on, with perhaps an implied censure on them for their inactivity in such ways. Chief among those who felt in this manner was Dr. Griffiths himself, whose own life had been passed in such retirement and seclusion that he was but imperfectly acquainted with the great world outside. His mind and Dr. Wiseman's were mutually uncongenial. Moreover, Dr. Wiseman was not afraid to find fault with many things which he saw, most of which were survivals of penal days, but which appeared to him, with his Roman traditions, as signs of want of zeal or piety among the clergy—an accusation which Dr. Griffiths vehemently resented. Thus, for example, he found special fault with the custom of keeping the Blessed Sacrament in a safe in the sacristy, and only moving it into the church at service time; but as England then was, no other arrangement was possible. The churches were never open except at service time, and those who were responsible would not have thought of leaving the Blessed Sacrament unprotected in case of burglary, or of the outbreak of riots such as those of 1780. Then again Wiseman deplored what appeared to him the want of priestly spirit among the clergy, which he said

called for reform. Dr. Griffiths looked on all this fault-finding as due to want of experience, and indeed of knowledge of the conditions under which the priests worked on the English mission. As a matter of duty, he went to hear the sermons which were attracting such attention; but he simply notes in his diary that the preacher was "eloquent, but not so effective as Rev. J. A. Hearne".[1]

Dr. Bramston, however, appreciated the lectures to the full, and begged Dr. Wiseman to repeat the experiment at Moorfields, where the church would be large enough to accommodate the crowds. This he accordingly did the following Lent, with even greater success than before, and the spacious church, of which London Catholics were so proud, proved too small to contain all those who flocked to hear him. His lectures were very long, always over an hour, and occasionally twice that time; yet his audience manifested no sign of impatience, nor did they decrease in numbers in successive weeks. When Lent was over, Dr. Wiseman determined to revise the manuscript of the lectures, and have them printed. The following interesting details are given by the well-known Catholic publisher, Mr. Booker, in a letter to Dom Joseph Brown at Downside, dated March 29, 1836:—[2]

"We have been obliged to decide with Dr. Wiseman to issue *forthwith* a cheap 12mo edition of the lectures he has been delivering, as they have made so much noise here. The Dissenters, etc., have been taking them down in shorthand, and one has commenced an edition in *his own fashion*. To prevent the mischief that would infallibly ensue, I have bought all his works, and am going to begin directly a cheap edition of those on the Church, Rule of Faith, etc., *merely as delivered*. . . . Dr. Wiseman means to bring out later another edition of the lectures in 8vo, fully revised and corrected, and with notes and illustration, so as to be fit for the library of the learned and the literate."

This work occupied Dr. Wiseman a great part of the summer. The Catholics of London showed their appreciation of all he had been doing by opening a subscription, and

[1] One of the "chaplains" at Lincoln's Inn Fields, and since the death of Dr. Archer in 1835, commonly looked upon as the best preacher in London.

[2] *Downside Archives.*

presenting him with a gold medal, with a likeness of himself, and the following legend :—

"Nicolao Wiseman, avita religione forti suavique eloquio vindicata, Catholici Londinenses MDCCCXXXVI."

It was during Dr. Wiseman's stay in London that the project was formed of establishing a Catholic review which should be of a form and *calibre* to be read outside as well as within the Catholic body. This standard the previous attempts at Catholic journalism had not reached. The *Orthodox Journal* had an intermittent existence spread over many years; but after Milner had ceased his contributions, it lost its chief attraction, and although the vigorous personality of William Eusebius Andrews, its editor, always gave it some influence over a certain section of Catholics, it never had any literary merit; while the continuous invective of the editor against every one with whom he did not entirely sympathise became tedious. After his death—which took place in 1837—his son tried for a few years to continue the periodical, and the numbers which he brought out were not lacking in interest, and were read a good deal by the Tractarians. But it became evident that with the death of its founder it had lost its chief source of support, and after some years of struggling existence, it finally ceased to appear after the close of the year 1845.

Several other Catholic periodicals had appeared at intervals, such as the *Catholic Miscellany*, the *Catholic Spectator*, *Catholicon*, and others. By far the best of these was the *Catholic Magazine* which appeared from 1830 to 1835 inclusively, under the joint editorship of Dr. Kirk of Lichfield and the Rev. Thomas McDonnell of St. Peter's, Birmingham. The life of the *Magazine* was not without its vicissitudes and storms, which more than once led to the threatened resignation of the editors. It was never meant to be read by others than Catholics, and never in fact penetrated beyond that body. The editors, however, were perfectly satisfied with their readers. In the defence of themselves which they inserted in answer to their critics, they say[1] with quaint assurance, that "the Catholic Clergy of the United Kingdom . . . constitute a community surpassing beyond comparison any and every other in the com-

[1] January, 1835, p. 2.

bination of learning, genius, intelligence, correctness of moral views, and independence of character". The *Magazine* during the six years of its existence included within its pages several documents of historical value for Catholics, such as we should expect from Dr. Kirk's editorship, as, for example, the Rev. Joseph Hodgson's narrative of the experiences of the Douay Collegians during the Reign of Terror, or Dr. Poynter's paper on the Douay funds ; and Dr. Kirk himself wrote many articles which are valuable for reference on English Catholic history. His account of Lisbon College appeared first in the *Magazine.* So also Charles Butler's *Life of Challoner* was reprinted in it. From time to time articles would appear from the pen of Dr. Lingard or of Rev. Mark Tierney—then just developing into prominence as a historian—and occasionally one by Dr. Wiseman himself. Other less prominent writers, such as Dr. Weedall of Oscott or Rev. F. C. Husenbeth, also contributed ; but Dr. Kirk, notwithstanding his great learning, had little literary sense, and this is evident in every number of the *Magazine.*

The scheme for a quarterly review which was ventilated during Dr. Wiseman's visit to London therefore was for a periodical of a different character from any which had formerly appeared, the whole aim being that it should be a power to influence those outside the Catholic body. The first idea of it was due to one Mr. Michael Quin, a native of Thurles in Ireland, who had come over to practise at the English bar, and lived in London. He had devoted himself chiefly to journalism, and he seems to have promoted the scheme exclusively from a business point of view. The real strength of the venture, however, was not financial ; there was a double power at its back, one being the reputation of Dr. Wiseman as a scholar, the other the influence of O'Connell over his fellow-countrymen. These two were practically the founders of the new quarterly. The name given to it was the *Dublin Review,* probably after the example of the *Edinburgh Review* ; for as Scotland might be looked upon as the home of a certain particular phase of Protestantism, so Ireland is undoubtedly the home of Catholicism. Hence the *Review* was published with a green cover, and the national arms with the old motto "Eire go bragh" in Irish letters. The hope that it would circulate in Ireland was realised

to some extent at the beginning; but it has always been published in London, and has in fact been the organ of English, not of Irish, Catholicism.

The first number appeared in May, 1836; the second in the following July. By this time, however, it was evident that the venture would not be a financial success, and Mr. Quin retired from the editorship. The third number was brought out by Rev. Mark Tierney; the next two by Mr. James Smith, a Catholic of Edinburgh, and father of Dr. William Smith, Archbishop of that city. O'Connell had then practically lost touch with the *Review*, and Dr. Wiseman continued it on his own responsibility. His friend Mr. Henry Bagshawe became nominal editor, but Dr. Wiseman continued to direct it from a distance, by frequent correspondence, and he in fact took the chief share of the editorial control.

From its first appearance the *Dublin Review* always maintained a high level of literary excellence. The heart and soul of it was Dr. Wiseman, who not only wrote numerous articles himself, but also by his influence and his European reputation as a scholar, succeeded in obtaining the co-operation of many distinguished writers. Among these may be mentioned Augustus de Morgan, who wrote articles on scientific subjects, and Professor de Coux who wrote on politics and political economy, and others of equal eminence. He also secured the continual assistance of the Rev. Charles Russell of Maynooth (afterwards President), and other well-known Irish writers.

In England itself also he secured the services of some valuable assistants. Among them may be mentioned Mr. Thomas Chisholm Anstey, then pursuing his studies for the law. He was a member of an old Devonshire family, and his father was one of the early settlers in the new colony of Van Dieman's Land (Tasmania), from whence Chisholm Anstey returned to London in 1831 to pursue his studies at University College, then recently established. He seems soon to have fallen in with Mr. Charles Weld, eldest son of Mr. Weld of Chideock, afterwards well known as a supporter of all Catholic good works. They were pursuing the same course of studies, and were fellow-students a little later at the Middle Temple. It is thought to have been in great part due to

Charles Weld's influence that Chisholm Anstey was led to become a Catholic in 1833. The latter's ardent and enthusiastic temperament soon showed itself in the happiness which he felt in his new religion. Writing to his mother on January 8, in 1834, he describes his first Catholic Christmas.[1] "I dined on Christmas Day with Dr. Bramston," he writes, "having previously heard Mass at the Sardinian Ambassador's Chapel in Duke Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields. Such music! I thought of you at the Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament when the *Adeste Fideles* was sung. I had that morning, or rather on Christmas eve, received the Communion at a Midnight Mass in that Chapel, having confessed a few hours before. The service is wonderfully impressive at midnight, although only a Low Mass."

Chisholm Anstey was called to the Bar in 1835, and when the *Dublin Review* was founded he became a frequent contributor to its pages. And he in turn exercised influence over others, sometimes in most unexpected quarters, and was the means under God of their conversion. Chief among these should be mentioned the well-known Frederick Lucas, founder and first editor of the *Tablet*, also a member of the Middle Temple. Anstey records his conversion in a letter to his father dated December 21, 1838:—[2]

"I have succeeded in inducing, after two years' hard trial, a Quaker friend of mine, just called to the Bar, to become a Catholic. I am to be his Godfather; the baptism will take place probably to-morrow. He is a man of enormous metaphysical intellect and of great learning: his metaphysics like mine are German. Having been for some years contracted to be married to a Quaker lady, he had just commenced the work of her conversion, and as she herself announced yesterday, with success so far as her argumentative objections were concerned, although she says she finds the prejudice of the inclination still opposes some resistance. Of course therefore she will be a Catholic immediately."

The reception and baptism took place the following day as arranged, at the hands of Father Lythgoe, S.J., and a few

[1] See MS. *Life* by his daughter, a Benedictine nun at Stanbrook Abbey, Worcestershire.

[2] *Ibid.*

weeks later Anstey and Lucas went together for a tour through Belgium, to see Catholic life in Catholic surroundings. After his reception into the Church, Lucas also became a contributor to the *Dublin Review;* but his work, both literary and political, belongs to a rather later date than that with which we are now concerned, and we shall come across it in future chapters.

During the last months of Dr. Wiseman's stay in England two events happened which gave him food for thought and reflection. One of them was the great fire of Prior Park, which destroyed the central building, or "mansion house," as it was called, on the evening of May 30, 1836. The fire originated in the roof, by the over-heating of a flue, and spread downwards with astonishing rapidity and effect. The following account, taken from a local paper, will give some idea of the extent of the damage done:—[1]

"About half-past five on Monday evening, the 30th of May, some of the students who were pursuing their studies in the open air noticed a quantity of thick smoke proceeding from the roof of the eastern part of the mansion. In a few minutes afterwards the flames broke forth, and then commenced a scene of devastation the extent and rapidity of which are almost without example. . . . In about an hour from the first discovery of it the whole roof was wrapped in one general conflagration. Shortly afterwards it fell in, and the ceiling above the extensive library having given way, the work of destruction advanced with terrible rapidity. At eight o'clock the whole library was one undistinguishable blaze. The centre of the building being thus involved in the conflagration, all expectations of saving any large part of it seemed hopeless, as in a short time the whole of the apartments on the library floor, with two exceptions, fell a prey to the flames.

"The chapel belonging to the establishment, which is a rich specimen of Palladian architecture, occupies the extremity of the whole of the Eastern end of the edifice. During the entire progress of the fire, the utmost efforts were exerted to prevent its interior from receiving any material injury. Happily those efforts were in a great degree crowned with success. On the first intimation of the danger, and when it was found impossible to save the entire chapel, the Taber-

[1] See *Catholicon*, July, 1836, p. clxx.

nacle and other movable parts of the altar, composed of jasper, statuary, lapis lazuli, etc., etc., were taken to a place of safety, it is hoped without having sustained much injury. It was found impossible to remove the front and remaining parts of the altar, which consist of a very costly piece of African jasper, surrounded with a border of white statuary, having the base and sides of black and gold. These portions of the altar, however, remain uninjured, the chancel having been protected by a semidome.

"At a quarter to nine the fire had extended into the first floor—that immediately above the basement, from the window at the south end of which, in consequence of the wind having somewhat risen, it raged most furiously, and in a short time the Bishop's private chapel, in the western extremity of the mansion, was destroyed."

The fire naturally caused great excitement in Bath, and numbers of onlookers made their way out to the College. The Mayor rode up on horseback as soon as he heard of it, and it is said that the number of spectators exceeded 10,000. In view of the commanding situation of the College, the burning building made a magnificent spectacle. Eventually the firemen succeeded in limiting the conflagration to the centre block, and the two Colleges on either side remained unharmed. That of St. Paul was approaching completion, and it was forthwith pressed into service, so that the work of the institution was not interrupted. The damage to the centre building, with all its art treasures, was estimated at £15,000, only one-third of which was covered by insurance.

We can perhaps picture to ourselves Dr. Wiseman's feelings on learning of the disaster, and his natural longing to be of assistance to his former friend in this hour of his misfortune: but circumstances had changed, and it was left to Dr. Baines to face his troubles by himself. This he did with remarkable courage. He wrote to his brother Bishops and a common appeal was issued, signed by all of them; and profiting by the good feeling shown by the people of Bath, he also issued an appeal to them independently of their religion. From both sources he received a fair response, but the magnitude of the damage made it impossible to meet it all at once. He was able to raise enough money from other sources to have the

mansion rebuilt on a complete scale, but the financial difficulty in which he was placed weighed on him for long afterwards.

The other event to be alluded to is the death of Dr. Bramton, which occurred a few weeks later. The Bishop's last public act was to sing Mass at the opening of the church at St. John's Wood, about which there had been the dispute. The function took place on February 9, 1836. Dr. Griffiths preached on the occasion, while Bishop Walsh and Dr. Wiseman both assisted on the sanctuary. A few weeks later Dr. Bramston paid his last visit to St. Edmund's College, when he consecrated the Holy Oils on Maundy Thursday, and held an Ordination on Holy Saturday. After Easter his health became steadily worse until the month of June, when he determined to seek a change of air. With great difficulty he travelled as far as Southampton, arriving there on July 4; but the journey proved too much for him in the enfeebled state of his constitution. He gradually sank, and having received the last rites at the hands of the Rev. William Hunt—the future Provost of Westminster—he calmly expired on July 11, 1836.

In accordance with his own request, his body was brought back to London, and the obsequies were celebrated at Moorfields on July 27. High Mass was sung by Dr. Griffiths, the sermon being preached by Rev. John Hearne of Lincoln's Inn Field, who has been already mentioned. His body was placed in the clergy vault, beside those of Dr. Poynter and Dr. Gradwell. When Moorfields was pulled down in 1899, it was removed with the others, and now rests under the Chapel Cloister at St. Edmund's College, to remind us of the convert Bishop, who by his sweet disposition and unremitting labour during a long life, earned the love and respect of all who knew him.

On the death of Dr. Bramston, his Coadjutor, Dr. Griffiths, succeeded as Vicar Apostolic, and administered the District single-handed during the remaining ten years of his life. From what has been already said it will be realised that Dr. Wiseman felt keenly the loss of Dr. Bramston, and did not look with any great favour on his successor. He left England on his return to Rome early in September, 1836, apparently convinced that the only way to induce Dr. Griffiths to move forward would be to get the Holy See to send him periodical

orders, or injunctions on behalf of the English mission. This line was in fact pursued, the orders being sometimes communicated through Dr. Wiseman himself. Dr. Griffiths's own friends, however, took quite a different view, contending that he was fully alive to the state of transition in which Catholicism then was in England, and the need of keeping pace with the forward movement; but that he did so with prudence, without any ostentation or publicity, and as far as possible, by using and trusting his own clergy. He was undoubtedly more sceptical about the prospects to be looked for from the Oxford Movement than was Dr. Wiseman, but he would have met any conversions in a sympathetic, if perhaps an old-fashioned and somewhat narrow spirit. In view of Dr. Griffiths's position as the London Vicar Apostolic, it was only natural to assume that in the ordinary course his views would prevail. Hence the continual efforts on the part of Dr. Wiseman and Propaganda during the next few years to stimulate him to action more conformable to their Roman ideals often led to difficult and delicate situations, which we shall have to record as we proceed.

CHAPTER VI.

AUGUSTUS WELBY PUGIN.

WE must now interrupt the narrative for a while, in order to devote a chapter to the consideration of one who had a large share of influence in the history of Catholics at this time, who by consent of friend and foe alike is reckoned as one of the most remarkable men of his day, Augustus Welby Pugin, who began by inspiring an enthusiasm which swept away all the opposition due to the conservatism and lethargy of the old Catholics, for a while reigned supreme over the destinies of their architecture, but eventually divided the Catholic body into two parties, deeply and even bitterly opposed to one another on questions of far deeper moment than that of mere taste in ecclesiastical ornament.

The name of Pugin will always be inseparably bound up with the Gothic revival which took place during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. He was not, however, the initiator of it, as is often loosely implied. There were plenty of signs of the revival even among the Catholic body before he appeared on the scene of action. Milner's church at Winchester dated from 1792, and was perhaps the earliest instance of a return to the former style of church building, and its architect, Mr. John Carter, designed also other Gothic churches. St. Mary's Cathedral at Cork, opened in 1808, was Gothic, and in England, Sir William Jerningham's chapel at Cossey, opened in the following year, was of a similar style. Later on the church at Stonyhurst and the whole College at Oscott, though built at a time when Pugin had begun his work, were independent of any influence exerted by him; and the same may be said of a large number of chapels in the pointed style built up and down the country.

But if Pugin did not initiate the Gothic revival, he

Augustus Welby Pugin

certainly developed it by his unique personality in a way that no one else could have done, and introduced a spirit and significance into the movement which it would never otherwise have possessed. A short account of his personal history will be necessary in order to understand the spirit with which he performed his work.

Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin was born in London on March 1, 1812. His father, known as the Elder Pugin[1]—his full name was Augustus Charles Comte de Pugin—came from Freiburg-im-Breisgau. In his youth he had been brought up a Catholic; but he had long fallen away from his religion. During the Revolution he took refuge in England, and becoming a clerk in the office of the celebrated architect John Nash, known as the designer of Regent Street, and the rebuilder of Buckingham Palace, had quickly made a name for himself as a man of unusual talent, and settled permanently in England. He was a draftsman rather than an architect, and made his reputation chiefly by his work in drawing plans for that class of castellated mansion which, under the influence of Horace Walpole and Sir Walter Scott, had become characteristic of the public taste at that time. He was a man of stern life and austere habits, and trained his son from his youth to work and self-denial. After a few years during which he attended Christ's Hospital for his education, while still a boy, Welby Pugin entered his father's office. He found he had entered the service of an exacting master. His hours were from six in the morning to eight at night: nevertheless, he was always ready for work, and displayed unusual talent, in consequence of which his father took him with him more than once to France, to study the architecture there. Even at that early age his enthusiastic nature asserted itself, and his excitement at what he saw and his unremitting work in making drawings, caused him to become positively ill.

In the year 1827 the Elder Pugin received a commission to prepare drawings for proposed Gothic furniture at Windsor Castle. He saw in this a great opportunity, and boldly handed over the work to his son, then only fifteen years old. Not-

[1] By some confusion, Welby Pugin has sometimes been spoken of as "the Elder Pugin," in contrast to his sons who were architects: but the received usage is to denote his father by that title as in the text.

withstanding his youth, Welby Pugin carried it out with marked success, and indeed it was this which sowed the seeds of his reputation. In after years, however, when his "second education" in architecture was further advanced, he exhibited great contempt for his own early efforts, and especially for his work at Windsor; and he was not afraid of expressing his sentiments in the forcible language which was congenial to his intense nature. Writing in 1841 he says :—[1]

"Upholsterers seem to think that nothing can be Gothic unless it is found in some church. Hence your modern man designs a sofa or occasional table from details culled out of Britain's Cathedrals, and all the ordinary articles of furniture, which require to be simple and convenient, are made not only very expensive, but very uneasy. A man who remains any length of time in a modern Gothic room, and escapes without being wounded by some of its minutiæ, may consider himself extremely fortunate. There are often as many pinnacles and gablets about a pier-glass frame as are to be found in an ordinary church, and not unfrequently the whole canopy of a tomb has been transferred for the purpose, as at Strawberry Hill.[2] I have perpetrated many of these enormities in the furniture I designed some years ago for Windsor Castle. At that time I had not the least idea of the principles I am now explaining; all my knowledge of pointed architecture was confined to a tolerably good notion of details in the abstract: but these I employed with so little judgment or propriety that although the parts were correct and exceedingly well executed, collectively they appeared a complete burlesque of pointed design."

For a time it appeared as though Pugin's talents would be employed in a very different direction. A chance acquaintance formed during his work at Windsor gave him an introduction to the stage, and soon he was pouring out his enthusiasm over the designing of scenic effects for the theatre. Fortunately the venture was not a success. He acquired indeed some taste and experience which was to be a valuable help to his imagination in the future and then returned to architecture. He married, and for a time lived in his father's house in Great

[1] *True Principles of Pointed Architecture*, p. 40.
[2] The residence of Horace Walpole.

Russell Street, Bloomsbury. His wife, however, died in childbirth, and soon afterwards his parents died. He married a second time in 1833, and built himself a house near Salisbury, which he called St. Marie's Grange, where he lived for a while, under the shadow of the glorious Cathedral said to be of the purest and most uniform style of any in England. Yet his proximity to it was far from being the cause of unalloyed satisfaction, for it had undergone a so-called "restoration," which was a continual source of irritation to him. The "restoration" had involved the destruction of the screen of the Lady Chapel—the oldest part of the Cathedral—and also the rood-loft of the main choir, and the removal of the monuments to their present sites, all in a line beside the arches of the nave. Several of the side chapels had also been destroyed, as well as the porch outside the north transept. The architect responsible for these changes was Mr. Wyatt, for whom no language, in Pugin's opinion, could be too severe — "the villain Wyatt" — "this monster of architectural depravity"—"this pest of Cathedral Architecture" —are specimens of the language he used. And speaking of the work of one of Mr. Wyatt's pupils in Ely Cathedral, he says that he was "a pupil of the wretch himself, and has imbibed all the vicious propensities of his accursed tutor, without one spark even of practical ability to atone for his misdeeds".

The next year after he had settled at Salisbury, that is, in 1834, his conversion to Catholicism took place—a step which was to give life a new meaning to him. He arrived at the determination entirely spontaneously, having worked the matter out for himself—for at that time he had never spoken to a Catholic priest. He has left us an account of the motives that led to his change of faith, which is of sufficient interest to quote in full :—[1]

"My education certainly was not of a description to bias me towards Catholicism ; I had been taught to view it through the same distorted medium as the generality of persons in this country ; and by the time I was at all capable of thinking on the subject, I was thoroughly imbued with all the popular

[1] See *Recollections of Pugin*, by Benjamin Ferrey, p. 103.

notions of racks, faggots, and fires, idolatry, sin-purchase, etc., with all the usual tissue of falsehood so industriously propagated throughout the land, that by such means men may be led to detest and fear what they would receive with joy and reverence could they but behold it in simple truth.

"It was, I say, with such perverted feelings that I became a student in ancient art. Soon, however, I found it necessary to begin a new and different course of study to what I had hitherto pursued. The origin, intention, and use of all I beheld around was then perfectly unintelligible to me; but applying myself to liturgical knowledge, what a new field was open to me! with what delight did I trace the fitness of each portion of those glorious edifices to the rites for whose celebration they had been erected! Then did I discover that the service I had been accustomed to attend and admire was but a cold and heartless remnant of past glories, and that those prayers which in my ignorance I had ascribed to reforming piety were in reality only scraps plucked from the solemn and perfect offices of the ancient Church. Pursuing my researches among the faithful pages of the old chronicles, I discovered the tyranny, apostacy, and bloodshed by which the new religion had been established, the endless strifes, dissensions, and discord that existed among its propagators, and the devastation and ruin that attended its progress: opposed to all this I considered the Catholic Church; existing with uninterrupted Apostolical succession, handing down the same faith, sacraments, and ceremonies unchanged, unaltered, through every clime, language and nation.

"For upwards of three years did I earnestly pursue the study of this all-important subject; and the irresistible force of truth penetrating my heart, I gladly surrendered my own fallible judgment to the unerring decisions of the Church, and embracing with heart and soul its faith and discipline, became an humble, but I trust faithful member.

"I therefore hope that in Christian charity my conversion will not any longer be attributed solely to my admiration of architectural excellence; for although I have freely acknowledged that my attention was first directed through it to the subject, yet I must distinctly state that so important a change

was not effected in me but by the most powerful reasons, and that after a long and earnest examination." [1]

The conversion of Pugin to the Catholic faith was part of a mental development which eventuated in 1836 in the publication of his celebrated book of *Contrasts*, which established his reputation once for all. Yet considering the time and surroundings in which he lived, surely a stranger book has never been written, and it is no wonder that he could not find a publisher to accept it. To call it an attack on Protestantism would be ridiculously understating the terms of contempt which he poured forth on the Anglican establishment. His main thesis was summed up by him in his *Apology for the Contrasts*, written a few months later, as follows :—

"1. That everything grand, edifying, and noble in art is the result of feelings produced by the Catholic religion on the human mind.

"2. That destruction of art, irreverence towards religion, contempt of ecclesiastical persons and authority, and a complete loss of all the nobler perceptions of mankind have been the result of Protestantism, wherever it has been established.

"3. That the degraded state of the arts in this country is purely owing to the absence of Catholic feeling among its professors, the loss of ecclesiastical patronage, and the apathy with which a Protestant Nation must necessarily treat the higher branches of Art." [2]

In order to establish and illustrate these three propositions, he first devotes two chapters to extolling the architectural excellence attained in England before the Reformation, as exemplified by college chapels and monastic buildings ; then he proceeds to a chapter headed "Of the Pillage and Destruction of the Churches under Henry the Eighth," and another "On

[1] *Recollections*, p. 103. The author does not give any reference, but says that the letter appeared in "a public journal". It is curious that no written record of Pugin's reception into the Church seems to exist. The late Mrs. James Powell, whose memory of those days remained fresh to the very end, said that it took place at Salisbury in 1834.

[2] In a second edition of the *Contrasts*, published a few years later, and practically re-written, Pugin modified his thesis somewhat, describing Classical architecture as Pagan ; but he contended that there was a necessary connection between "revived Paganism" and Protestantism. "[They] both date from the same epoch," he said, "both spring from the same causes, and neither could possibly have been introduced had not Catholic feelings fallen to a very low ebb."

the Ravages and Destruction of the Churches suffered under Edward VI. and after the final establishment of the new Religion". Then in a final chapter he proceeds to contrast the present state of the great Cathedrals and Parish Churches which were built in the ages of Faith, with their former state.

"When these gigantic churches were erected," he writes,[1] "each portion of them was destined for a particular use, to which their arrangement and decoration perfectly corresponded. Thus the choir was appropriated solely to the ecclesiastics, who each filled their respective stalls; the nave was calculated for the immense congregation of the people who, without reference to rank or wealth, were promiscuously mixed in the public worship of God; while the aisles formed ample space for the solemn processions of the clergy. The various chapels, each with its altar, were served by different priests, who at successive hours of the morning, commencing at six, said Masses, that all classes and occupations might be enabled to devote some portion of the day to religious duties. The cloisters formed a quiet and sheltered deambulatory, for the meditation of the ecclesiastics; and the chapter house was a noble chamber, where they frequently met and settled on spiritual and temporal affairs relating to their office. These churches were closed only for a few hours during the night, in order that they might form the place from whence private prayers and supplications might continually be offered up.

"Of what use are these churches now? do their doors stand ever open to admit the devout? No; excepting for the brief space of time set apart twice a day to keep up the form of worship, the gates are fast closed, nor is it possible to obtain admittance within the edifice without a fee to the guardian of the keys. Ask the reason of this, and the answer will be that if the churches were left open, they would be completely defaced, and even become the scene of the grossest pollutions. If this be true, which I fear it is, what, I ask, must be the moral and religious state of a country where the churches are obliged to be fastened up to prevent their being desecrated and destroyed by the people? how must the ancient devotion and piety have departed? Indeed so utterly are all feelings of private devotion lost in these churches that were an individual to kneel

[1] *Contrasts* (second edition), p. 36.

in any other time than that actually set apart for Divine Service, or in any other part of the edifice than that which is enclosed, he would be considered as a person not sound in his intellects, and probably be ordered out of the building."

The condition of the typical Anglican church of those days was favourable to Pugin's thesis: the high private pews, for the use of distinguished families, sometimes containing a fireplace for the comfort of the occupants; the plain Communion table in place of the altar; the so-called "three-decker" pulpit, which was still common, formed as complete a contrast as could be desired to the ancient Catholic furniture and fittings, as he was not slow to see. "The manner of preparing the churches for the exercise of the new liturgy," he wrote, "consisted in blocking up the nave and aisles with dozing pens termed pews; above this mass of partitions rose a rostrum, for the preacher, reader, and his respondent; whilst a square table surmounted by the King's Arms, which had everywhere replaced the crucified Redeemer, conclude the list of necessary erections, which I need hardly say were as unsightly as the ancient arrangements were appropriate and beautiful."[1]

The Contrasts themselves consisted of twelve[2] pages of illustrations. On each was depicted, side by side, a type of a building or architectural feature used for a particular purpose belonging to the Middle Ages, and one serving a similar purpose in Pugin's day. The former was taken from a specimen altogether favourable, and was idealised, while the latter can hardly be described as less than a *travestie* of existing work. In this way a strong contrast was always obtained. Thus we have contrasted parish churches, one being the glorious Gothic church of St. Mary Redcliffe, at Bristol, perhaps the finest parish church in England; and opposite, the church in Langham Place, London, with its round portico, surmounted by a balustrade. St. George's, Windsor, with the ministers clad in mediaeval vestments at the altar, is then contrasted with the picture of the Chapel Royal at Brighton, with the preacher in the pulpit, and the royal party in the gallery opposite, looking entirely like a large box in a theatre. Then there are contrasted house fronts, contrasted inns, contrasted crosses in the highway

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[2] Some additional ones were added in the second edition.

—the cross at Chichester and King's Cross, London, respectively—and contrasted Bishops' palaces. In this last the ancient palace of the Bishop of Ely in Holborn is contrasted with the then existing one in Dover Street, and great play is made with the change of episcopal life owing to the cessation of celibacy. In the Holborn palace is given St. Etheldreda's Chapel, which has since returned to Catholic hands, and a library, cloister, guest-room, and hall. In the modern house the most prominent feature consists of the windows of the nursery, below which are a drawing-room and parlour; and a note, that "This house has been built with due regard to the modern style of episcopal establishments: all useless buildings, such as Chapel, Hall, or Library, have been omitted, and the whole is on a scale to combine economy with elegance".

As no publisher was willing to bring out the book, Pugin determined with characteristic vigour, to take all the risks himself, and had it printed at his own expense. Hence it appeared as "printed for the author and published by him at St. Marie's Grange, near Salisbury, Wilts". In those days the production of plates was a very costly affair, and he could hardly have expected to realise money on the transaction. In fact he lost a considerable sum; but the book made his reputation. Notwithstanding his attack on the Establishment, the press and the public appreciated his earnestness and accepted many of his conclusions. Public taste, already setting in towards a Gothic revival, was stimulated and educated. People did not indeed accept his theories that everything debased was due to Protestantism, and pointed, not without justice, to the fact that in countries such as, for example, France, which had remained Catholic, the decadence of art was no less, if indeed it was not much greater, than in Protestant England. In later times they have been able to point to much work of restoration, as well as of original designing, carried out within the Anglican establishment of a far finer kind than anything which modern Catholics have produced. Pugin himself indeed lived long enough to know that his ideals would never be properly realised among his generation of English or Irish Catholics. In one of his later works, published in 1850, he formally retracted much of his former position:—



EXAMPLE OF PUGIN'S "CONTRASTS"

"After the most patient investigation," he wrote,[1] "I have been compelled to adopt the conclusion that the most fearful acts of destruction and spoliation were committed by men who had not only been educated in the ancient faith, but who were contented externally to profess its doctrines. I had originally fallen into popular errors on these matters in some of my early publications, and it is but an act of justice to affix the odium of the sacrilege on those who are really guilty."

From the time of the publication of the *Contrasts* Pugin's work grew rapidly, and he very soon had as much as even he, with all his energy, could find time for. His out-of-the-way house at Salisbury quickly became unsuitable, and he migrated to Chelsea, and later on to Ramsgate, where he built himself another house which likewise he called "The Grange". This situation suited his tastes, for he was always a lover of the sea, and he spent many days sailing in his "lugger". On those days he was far from wasting his time. His active mind was ever at work, and many of his designs were thought out, and even plans drawn, at sea.

When at home, his life was always lived at high pressure. He was down every morning punctually at six, when the Angelus bell rang, and he made a short visit to his private Oratory. Then he worked for an hour and a half, before it was time for Prime, which was followed by Mass whenever a priest was in the house. This was succeeded by a rapid breakfast, and then he was hard at work till dinner, which he took at one. While at work he was impatient of any interruption, and should the door-bell ring, he would often call out that the visitor was not to be admitted. In the afternoon he worked on until nine o'clock; after which hour he gave himself to reading or study, broken by Compline, which was sung. Both at Prime and Compline he assisted in cassock and surplice.

In this way Pugin got through an extraordinary amount of work in his office. He had a wonderful facility with his pen. The amount of his correspondence was prodigious, and all his plans were drawn by his own hand. When his friends remonstrated with him, and urged him to engage a clerk for routine office work, he answered characteristically, "A clerk,

[1] *Treatise on Rood-Screens*, p. 6.

my dear sir? I never employ one; I should kill him in a week."

Of course under these circumstances Pugin could not have done all that he did unless he had been an extraordinarily rapid worker. "The pace at which he worked," writes his son-in-law, Mr. John Powell,[1] "would be incredible to anyone not seeing it. His few implements were at hand, and his design was in his brain distinct even to the detail, so without hesitation he pencilled or penned or brushed it in; he never rubbed out or altered, all was as easy as talking. He used any quick method, ruling in straight lines, striking in arcs with compasses: 'what does it matter how the effect is produced?' he said; 'the result is the thing'. He was just two hours making a large pen-and-ink interior of the Chapel of St. Edmund's College, with stalls, glass, and decoration. A coloured design for the east window of St. Mary Magdalen's College, Oxford, was asked for by one morning's post: it was posted by 11 a.m. The working drawings for St. Mary's, Handsworth, were wanted by a certain day on which he had promised to be at Westminster: so he got up at four, and stuck to it, watch on table, and he left by the midday train. These drawings exist, and are absolutely complete in every architectural detail."

But in truth his plans and correspondence at home were not the greatest part of what he performed. His practical work continually took him to all parts of England, and even across the water, for he erected several churches in Ireland. Most of his travelling was done at night, either in the mail coaches, or by train in the early days of railways; and on arrival in the morning, he did a full day's work regardless of his fatigue. When he was on the spot, he went into every detail, and mixed with his workmen, whom he often knew personally, for he considered it essential to have men used to his designs. Whenever possible he employed the same builder —Mr. Myers, of Lambeth—most of whose men were accustomed to him. He is described as of only just middle height, but with a very strong, broad chest, with thick long hair, clean-shaven face, and restless grey eyes. He was care-

[1] In some MS. notes, kindly placed at my disposal by his son, Mr. Pugin Powell, the present head of the firm Pugin & Pugin.

less and even slovenly with respect to his personal dress. When at work in his study he wore a large black velvet gown, designed by himself; but outside he is described as usually dressed in "a sailor's jacket, loose pilot boots, and a wide-awake hat". Hence he was not infrequently taken for one of the men employed on a building. He was wont to recite with glee how on one such occasion, when he had shown some chance visitors around one of his churches in course of construction, they showed blank bewilderment when in reply to their conventional question as to who was the architect, he answered, "I am, my dear Sir, Augustus Welby Northmore Pugin!"

The essential principle underlying all Pugin's work was that architecture should be a truthful exposition of the builder's art. "Pointed architecture," he said,[1] "does not conceal her construction, but beautifies it: classic architecture seeks to conceal instead of decorating it." As a prominent instance of this he pointed to the construction of roofs. Speaking of a Gothic timber roof he says: "The principal tie-beams, rafters, purlins, and braces, which in modern edifices are hidden at a vast expense by a flat plaster ceiling, are here rendered very ornamental features, and this essential portion of a building becomes its greatest beauty". "The stupendous roof of Westminster Hall, decidedly the grandest in the world," he adds, "illustrates this principle fully, as do the Collegiate halls of Oxford and Cambridge." In contrast with this he cites St. Paul's, "with its inner dome separated from the outer, in order to conceal the construction," so that he declares that "one half of the Church is designed to conceal the other half".

As another instance, he explains the flying buttress of a Gothic church as structural devices to obtain stability, and even the pinnacles which are commonly seen at their bases are, he says, necessary to strengthen the point of thrust by their weight, and at the same time by their shape to be a resistance to the weather. Elsewhere he develops the same idea further:—[2]

"An architect," he says, "should exhibit his skill by turning the difficulties which occur in raising an elevation from a convenient plan into so many picturesque beauties; and this constitutes the great difference between the principles of

[1] *True Principles*, p. 3, etc. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 63.

classic and pointed domestic architecture. In the former he would be compelled to devise expedients to conceal these irregularities; in the latter he has only to beautify them. But I am quite assured that all the irregularities that are so beautiful in ancient architecture are the result of certain necessary difficulties, and were never purposely designed; for to make a building inconvenient for the sake of obtaining irregularity would be scarcely less ridiculous than preparing working drawings for a new ruin."

He had an intense hatred of shams of all kinds. He was particularly eloquent in denouncing the modern mansions made on the plan of ancient castles, though curiously enough it was in drafting these that his father had made his name and reputation. This, however, he did not allow to stand in the way of his principles.

"What absurdities, what anomalies, what utter contradictions," he wrote,[1] "do not the builders of modern castles perpetrate! How many portcullises which will not lower down, and drawbridges which will not draw up! how many loopholes in turrets so small that the most diminutive sweep could not ascend them! On one side of the house machicolated parapets, embrasures, bastions and all the show of strong defence, and round the corner of the building a conservatory leading to the principal rooms, through which a whole company of horsemen might penetrate at one smash into the very heart of the mansion!—for who would hammer against nailed portals when he could kick his way in through the greenhouse? . . . The interior is not the least inconsistent portion of the edifices, for we find guard-rooms without either weapons or guards; sally-ports out of which nobody passes but the servants, and where a military man never did go out; donjon keeps which are nothing but drawing-rooms, boudoirs, and elegant apartments; watch-towers where the house-maids sleep; and a bastion in which the butler cleans his plate; all is a mere mask, and the whole building an ill-conceived lie."

Pugin carried his theories to absurd extremes. He called out for Gothic shops and Gothic railway arches, as being the only lasting and suitable kind, and he drew a Gothic railway

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 58.

station to contrast with the then new arch-entrance to Euston.[1] In his own house, all the furniture was Gothic, and he even designed Gothic moulds for the cook to use in making his puddings and jellies. He was not insensible to the humour of his actions, and on one occasion he wrote to a friend that his wife was about to present him with a Gothic baby.

Although, however, Pugin considered that the pointed style of architecture was in the first instance based upon considerations of utility, in applying it to ecclesiastical purposes and the building of churches, a new class of ideas altogether made themselves felt; for he saw in all the details of Gothic construction a symbolism which made it sacred in his eyes, and caused it to be termed by him Christian architecture. Thus the very form of the pointed arch, which he says originated from having to work in stone instead of wood, gave everything a height[2] which was considered as typical of the Resurrection; and so on with the various other details. We can quote his own words on this question:—[3]

"Pointed, or Christian, architecture has far higher claims on our admiration than mere beauty or antiquity; the former may be regarded as a matter of opinion, the latter in the abstract is no proof of excellence; but in it alone we find the faith of Christianity embodied, and its practices illustrated. The three great doctrines of the redemption of man by the sacrifice of our Lord on the cross; the three equal Persons united in one Godhead; and the resurrection of the dead are the foundation of Christian architecture. The first—the Cross—is not only the very plan and form of a Catholic Church, but it terminates each spire and gable, and is imprinted as a seal of faith on the very furniture of the altar. The second is fully developed in the triangular form and arrangement of arches, tracery, and even subdivisions of the buildings themselves.

[1] This is not meant to imply that a Gothic railway station or a Gothic shop are necessarily anomalies. In our own time we have the great station of St. Pancras before us as a witness to the contrary. Nevertheless the way in which Pugin spoke of Gothic stations and railway arches as likely to last for ever and every other kind as radically defective, indicates a mind hardly well balanced on such subjects.

[2] The low pointed arch, technically known as the "four centre arch," common in very late Gothic buildings, was considered by Pugin as against all true canons of architecture, and a sign of incipient decay.

[3] *Contrasts* (second edition), p. 4.

The third is beautifully exemplified by the great height and vertical lines which have been considered by the Christians from the earliest period as the emblem of the Resurrection. . . . But do not all the features and details of the churches erected during the Middle Ages set forth their origin, and at the same time exhibit the triumph of Christian truth? Like the religion itself, their foundations are in the cross and they rise from it in majesty and glory. The lofty nave and choir, with still loftier towers crowned by clusters of pinnacles and spires, all directed towards heaven, beautiful emblems of the Christian's brightest hopes, the shame of the Pagan; the cross raised on high in glory—a token of mercy and forgiveness—crowning the sacred edifice and placed between the anger of God and the sins of the city."

In contrast to this, Pugin maintained that Classical—or as he always called it, Pagan—architecture was the very reverse of all that he had described; its lines, he said, "grovel on the earth"; "its spirit and symbolism are those of death"; "its ornamentation reeking with skulls of animals, sacrificial altars and foliage"; "in its construction it is a mass of shams, beams of wood being imitated in marble and stone"; that its sole merit lies "in certain arithmetical proportions, and in the sculptor's skill"; that "Christian thought in Pagan costume is a discord in architecture and art"; that "the Renaissance was a huge mistake, sapped the good out of everything"; "it could live only so long as the Christian elements of truth lingered in it"; it was "destructive of all that is good in thought and material working"; it had "led to a revival of Pagan symbolism". "The inverted torch," he said, "the Club of Hercules, the Owl of Minerva, and the Cinerary Urn are carved in *lieu* of saints and angels on the tombs of Popes, Bishops, Kings, ecclesiastics, statesmen, and warriors, frequently accompanied by Pagan divinities, in Pagan nudity." "This poisonous tree [of the Renaissance]," he declared, "must be uprooted before the Christian tree can flourish."

From this we learn Pugin's idea of the sacredness of the architect's calling. In his words in reply to an Address by the students of St. Edmund's College in 1842 he expresses himself in this sense:—[1]

[1] See Appendix H.

"It is a privilege and a blessing to work in the sanctuary. The majesty of the vast churches of antiquity is owing to the sublime mysteries of the Christian faith. The ancient builders felt this. They knew the small share they could claim in the glories they produced, and their humility exceeded their skill. How unbecoming then would it be for any man at the present time to exult where works are after all but faint copies of ancient excellence. God has certainly permitted me to become an instrument in drawing attention to long-forgotten principles, but the merit of these belong to older and better days. I still enter even the humblest erections of Catholic antiquity as a disciple to the school of his master, and for all that is produced we must cry in most bounden duty, '*Non nobis Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam*'."

A word ought to be added with regard to Pugin's views as to rood-screens. This feature of his architecture has led to more bickering and ill-feeling than any other; and in some of his churches the screens since his time have been removed, sometimes so completely changing the character of the church as to render it hardly recognisable. Whatever view be taken of the necessity of such a measure there can be no doubt that it goes to the very root of Pugin's idea of Christian art. "If any man says he loves pointed architecture and hates screens," he was fond of saying, "that man is a liar—avoid that man, my dear Sir." And speaking of the work of the anti-screen men, he does not scruple to say that "they are practically insulting the traditions of the Church, impeding the restoration of devotion and solemnity, and injuring the progress of religion".

Yet there is no part of Pugin's work which has been more persistently misunderstood than his views about screens. He spoke indeed of the "mystical separation between the sacrifice and people"; and of the altar "far removed from irreverent gaze," and the like. Nevertheless, he admits that "it does not appear that the Latin Church has ever purposely excluded the sight of the altar from the people," and contends that closed screens have only existed in monastic or Cathedral churches, where they served the practical purpose of protecting from draughts those who had to spend long hours in choir. Hence he admits that "they are certainly most unsuitable for any churches to be erected in this country under existing circum-

stances, where the limited extent of means and number of the clergy render it necessary for all services to be available for the faithful in general, and the Bishops' churches, like the original basilicæ, to be in a manner parochial". And it is worth noting that several of his early churches had no screens.[1]

In stating his views about parish churches, he contents himself at the outset by saying that "from the earliest times the choirs and sanctuaries were separated off from the rest of the building by open metal work, and dwarf marble walls". From this it might at first sight appear that the railings which are always seen in churches which have no screens, would serve the purpose he postulates, but it is certain that he did not think so. His view was that there must be a more complete division between clergy and people than ordinary railings afford, in order to secure reverence for the Holy Mysteries celebrated within. He says indeed definitely that a screen is "inseparable from Catholic arrangement in any style, Byzantine, Pointed, Norman, or Debased," declaring that even in the old Roman basilicas, with the altar surrounded by the pillars sustaining the Ciborium, and the people being in front of the celebrant, nothing would have been visible of the latter "except an occasional glimpse of his head". While not wishing purposely to shut out the view of the altar, he contends that this question is simply immaterial. He writes as follows:—[2]

"It has been a charge and reproach made by Catholics against their separated countrymen that the old fabrics were unsuited to their service, and unquestionably on the principle that it was essential for *every one to hear*, they were so. But I will ask these new-fashioned men, if it is indispensable for *every one to see*, how much better are they adapted for modern Catholic rites? They become as unfit for one as the other, for it is unquestionable that comparatively very few persons in these cruciform churches could obtain a view of the altar, and this *independent of any screen work*, the disposition of the pillars intersecting and shutting out all those who are stationed in the aisles or transepts.

[1] For example, the small church at Uttoxeter, the first which he completed; St. Mary's, Derby, where the screen belongs to a later date; and his original design for St. George's, Southwark: see *Recollections*, p. 170.

[2] *Treatise on Chancel Screens and Rood Lofts*, p. 4.

"I have always imagined" (he continues) "that one great distinction between the Protestant and Catholic worship was this, that the former was essentially a *hearing* service, at which only a comparatively few persons could assist, while at the latter many thousands, or, indeed, hundreds of thousands, could unite in one great act of adoration and praise, concentrating their thoughts and intentions with the priest who is offering at God's altar, though he is far shut off from their vision." And a little later, commenting on what he calls the "modern all-seeing principle," he says that if carried out, it would lead to an absurd conclusion. "For if it be essential for every worshipper to see," he explains, "even a level room will not answer the purpose, and the floor must be raised like an amphitheatre to elevate the receding *spectators*, for unless the people be thus raised, they form a far greater barrier than any screen work. . . . If religious ceremonies are to be regarded as spectacles, they should be celebrated in regular theatres, which have been expressly invented for the purpose of accommodating great assemblages of persons to hear and see well. It has been most justly said that there is no legitimate halting-place between Catholic doctrine and positive infidelity, and I am quite certain there is none between a church built on Christian traditions and symbolism and Covent Garden theatre, with its pit, boxes, and gallery."

He adds in a footnote that he has "been credibly informed that an amphitheatre was deliberately proposed a few years since, as the best form of a Catholic church for London"; and we may now add that the principle of a floor sloping upwards as in a theatre has been actually adopted in numerous churches in the United States of America, and in one or two in this country.[1]

We can conclude this chapter by quoting his words in explanation of the essentially Catholic character of the Gothic revival as understood by him :—[2]

"I cannot dismiss this subject without a few remarks on those who seem to think that by restoring the details and accessories of pointed architecture they are reviving Catholic art.

[1] As *e.g.* in the new church of St. Mary's, Handsworth, Birmingham.
[2] *Contrasts* (second edition), p. 57.

Not at all. Unless the ancient arrangement be restored, and the true principles carried out, all mouldings, pinnacles, tracery and details, be they ever so well executed, are a mere disguise. It is a great profanation to deck out Protestant monstrosities in the garb of Catholic antiquity ; pew and gallery fronts with tracery panels ; reading-desks with canopied tops, and carved communion tables ; for however elaborate the ornaments—however costly the execution, and however correct the details may be in the abstract, unless a church be built on the ancient traditional form, it must appear a miserable failure. A follower of John Knox himself, as in the Scotch conventicle in London, may build a meeting house with pointed arches and tolerably good detail, but these will always look like the scattered leaves of a precious volume that have been bound up by an unskilful hand, without connexion, or relation to their meaning.

"To apply these venerable forms to any but their real intention is a perfect prostitution of this glorious style ; a Catholic Church not only requires pillars, arches, windows, screens, and niches, but *it requires them to be disposed according to a certain traditional form ;* it demands a chancel set apart for sacrifice, and screened off from the people ; it requires a stone altar, a sacrarium, sedilia for the officiating priests, and an elevated rood-loft from whence the Holy Gospel may be chanted to the assembled faithful ; it requires chapels for penance and prayer, a sacristy to contain the sacred vessels, a font for the holy sacrament of baptism, a southern porch for penitents and catechumens, a stoup for hallowed water, and a tower for bells ; and unless a building destined for a church possess all these requisites, however correctly its details may be copied from ancient authorities, it is a mere modern conventicle, and cannot by any means be accounted a revival of Catholic art."

CHAPTER VII.

PUGIN'S EARLY WORK.

AFTER reading of the high mystical ideals which Pugin had formed to himself of a typical Catholic place of worship, we can well realise how the reality as it existed in those days must have grated on his feelings in his own weekly or daily worship after he had been received into the Church. We can give the impression formed on his mind after his conversion, in the description he gave to his son-in-law, Mr. John Powell :—[1]

"Going into Catholic chapels (there were no churches then), what did I see? The very tabernacle a Pagan Temple, the altar a deal sarcophagus, over which a colossal eye within rays looked down from a flat ceiling, artificial flowers under glass shades between the altar candlesticks, costly marbles produced in cheap paper, brackets painted with sham shadows supporting nothing; and vestments, who can describe? In the music gallery soprano and contralto soloists publicly emulating each other, lady vergers in feathers collecting the offertories, High Masses advertised as attractions. Even Bishop Milner's own chapel, he, the Catholic pioneer of the revival, not exempt." When he heard Mass on Sundays at Margate [2]—then his nearest place of worship—he knelt on the gallery stairs, out of sight.

Although, however, Pugin was very pungent in his satire on the "Pagan-Temple-Tabernacle" style of the Catholic

[1] MS. in possession of his son, Mr. Pugin Powell.

[2] The priest at Margate, Rev. Thomas Costigan, was one of the old school, with more than his share of roughness, and complete innocence of all Pugin's liturgical aspirations. He served the church—one of the ordinary "conventicle" type then in vogue—for close on forty years, and was said to have seventy-five miles of sea-front in his district. With all his roughness, however, he had a good knowledge of the Fathers, and in their writings he found common ground with Pugin.

Chapel of his day, he understood that architecture was only a means to an end. When he went to Ireland he was filled with admiration at what he saw: "the faithful," he said, "were kneeling in hundreds outside a hut, in the mud and rain, while the candles were stuck into a lump of clay, and lit through a hole in the wall". Such faith he considered was better than any architecture. But in England he saw no such redeeming feature, and attributing the decadence to want of knowledge and thought, considered that the very first need of the hour was to remedy it, so as to place the ancient faith in its true light before the unbelieving Protestant, and so affect his conversion. If only some churches could be built in the style and after the plan adopted by our Catholic forefathers, in which the liturgy could be carried out with reverence and decorum, and the ancient plain song of the Church—so closely connected in his mind with ecclesiastical art—supplant the light operatic music then in vogue, he thought that substantial progress would have been made towards the conversion of England.

In his endeavours towards the accomplishment of his aspirations, Pugin found several friends who were able to be of much assistance. First and foremost among these must be mentioned the well-known and saintly John Talbot, sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, who was perhaps the most remarkable man among the old Catholics of his day. He was born in 1791, and educated partly at Stonyhurst, partly at St. Edmund's; but while at the latter College in 1809 he headed a rebellion among the boys, in consequence of which he had to leave, and he completed his education under a private tutor—the well-known Dr. Kirk of Lichfield. Afterwards he travelled for a time, and had several adventures. On one occasion he was taken prisoner in an affray with an American privateer, while returning from Spain, but was immediately released and found his way back to England. In 1814 he married a niece of the Earl of Mountmorris, but he still lived for the most part abroad, until in 1827, at the age of thirty-six, he succeeded his uncle as sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, and took up his residence at Alton Abbey—as it was then—the family seat near Cheadle in Staffordshire. Here he led a life of retirement similar to that which was customary among hereditary Catholics, and his personal virtues were worthy of

the best traditions of his family. We can quote the testimony of Bishop Ullathorne in a letter written in 1852. "As Lord Shrewsbury's history comes out," he wrote,[1] "it shows what a saintly man he was. His love of purity all his life was remarkable, as well as his spirit of poverty. No servant in the house had his room so poor as was the private room of the Earl—a picture of St. Francis of Assisi; old-fashioned common paper; faded, worn-out curtains; no prospect from the windows; the commonest painted deal furniture, and common earthenware, with an old broken-down chest of drawers. It was as poor as any convent cell could be."

He was a close student of Catholic antiquities, and during a stay in Rome some years before, he had made the acquaintance of the celebrated archæologist, Rev. Daniel Rock, D.D., then a student at the English College, and their similarity of tastes produced the beginning of what was to become a life-long friendship. No sooner was the Earl settled in his new home than he asked Dr. Rock to become his chaplain. The invitation was accepted, and Alton became a centre for the study of Catholic antiquity.

It was during the early years which he spent at Alton that Dr. Rock wrote his first great work, to which he gave the name of *Hierurgia*. Its nature can be gathered from the first two paragraphs of his Preface:—

"Of the more intelligent and inquiring amongst our Protestant fellow-countrymen, several have occasionally manifested a desire to see a manual which not only contained the prayers, but explained the ceremonies and elucidated the doctrine of the Mass. The purpose of these pages is to fill up such a deficiency in the number of those well-composed and highly useful expositions of Catholic doctrine which we already possess.

"The work is divided into two parts; the first of which embraces the Ordinary of the Mass in Latin and in English, to which are appended notes explanatory of the ceremonies and of the Ritual of the Liturgy. The second part contains dissertations on the doctrine of the Eucharist as a Sacrifice and a Sacrament; on the Invocation of Saints; on Purgatory; on Images; on Ceremonies; on the Vestments, and the

[1] *Letters*, p. 26.

history of their origin and gradual change to their present form; and on several points of ritual and disciplinary observance."

He pointed out further that much of his archæology had been gained in the Roman Catacombs, during his seven years' student-residence in the Eternal City, and a subsequent visit there in company with his patron, the Earl of Shrewsbury.

The publication of *Hierurgia* led to a correspondence between Dr. Rock and Pugin, which also proved the beginning of a permanent intimacy between them, fostered by the opportunities afforded by the architect's visits to Alton. The acquaintance between the Earl of Shrewsbury and Pugin is said to have been due to a chance meeting in a shop in the year 1832. Lord Shrewsbury had been admiring some designs for the Gothic style of furniture then in vogue, and on asking who was the designer, was introduced to Pugin, who was then still a Protestant. Naturally therefore, when a few years later he was contemplating some additions and restorations in the family mansion, he sent for the man whose drawings he had admired, and who had since been received into the Catholic Church.

On arriving at Alton, Pugin found himself in an atmosphere wholly congenial to him. Many were the discussions which he held with Lord Shrewsbury and his learned chaplain as to the future of the Church in England, and the possibility of restoring some of the glory of the past, while Lord Shrewsbury's position and income enabled him to help in a substantial manner towards the carrying out of the architect's great ideas. Bishop Walsh was also keenly interested in the same movement, and the Midland District soon became the centre of the Gothic revival. At Alton itself Pugin designed additions including the noble towers which are such a feature of the mansion, and from which it henceforth took its name.

Another close friend of Pugin's, and likewise of the Earl of Shrewsbury, was the well-known Cambridge convert, Mr. Ambrose Lisle Phillipps—afterwards Mr. Phillipps de Lisle—and he too lived in the Midland District. Notwithstanding long-continued ill-health in his younger days, and many prognostications of a short life, in the event he lived to a ripe old age, and brought up a large family. In 1833 he was married

John Talbot, Sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury

to an orphan niece of Lord Clifford, and took up his residence on the family estate in Leicestershire. His father, Mr. Charles March Phillipps, M.P. for Leicestershire in four successive reigns, was still living, and resided at the family seat at Garenden Park; but he made over the old manor of Grace Dieu—once a Priory of Augustinianesses—to his son, who having built a new mansion, took up his abode there. He fitted up his domestic chapel, which was afterwards enlarged and improved by Pugin, and such liturgy as was possible in small surroundings was carried out with great care.

The one longing of his life was to see the conversion of England, and he was persuaded that he would live to see it. For this end he worked and hoped. He soon gathered together a small congregation around his little chapel at Grace Dieu, and he also organised the establishment of missions in the neighbouring villages. Three of these were already open in 1837, and others followed afterwards. A considerable amount of good was done, both in reclaiming lapsed Catholics and in receiving converts; but in the latter respect the results did not reach the founder's expectations. Writing to the Earl of Shrewsbury in 1839, he says:—[1]

"On the first Sunday in Lent, Bishop Walsh confirmed twenty-seven converts in our chapel; all this sounds very well, and looks well at the moment; but it is slow work after all, and if we go on at that rate we may wait a great many years before we convert even the single parish of Whitwick, containing as it does three thousand inhabitants. And then when one thinks how few priests there are, and how very few parishes with either a chapel or a priest, I sometimes am inclined to question the correctness of our bright anticipations for this country."

The chief work, however, which entitled the name of Mr. Lisle Phillipps to a lasting memory in English Catholic history was the establishment of the well-known Cistercian Abbey at Mount St. Bernard's in which Pugin was closely concerned. The idea of this foundation took its rise from the visit of a Cistercian monk, Dom Norbert Woolfrey, who came in 1833 to solicit alms for the building of the now famous monastery at Mount Melleray in Ireland. That monastery was indeed

[1] *Life*, by Sheridan Pursell, i., p. 105.

indirectly descended from the French Trappist community which had been received at Lulworth during the Revolution by Mr. Weld. During their twenty-three years' stay at Lulworth, they had been joined by many English and Irish novices, and would probably have gradually become an English-speaking community had they been allowed to remain. In 1817, however, they received commands from the Government either to cease to receive British subjects, or to leave the country. They chose the latter alternative, and left our shores on July 10, 1817, over sixty in number, bound for Meillerai in Brittany, where they established themselves on what appeared to be a secure foundation. During the Revolution of 1830, however, their monastery was once more dissolved, and the greater number of the English-speaking members set sail for Ireland. The French portion of the community were temporarily dispersed, but were afterwards able to reassemble in their old monastery. The Irish contingent bought a property near Cappoquin, Co. Waterford, which they named Mount Melleray, after their former home; and it was in order to obtain assistance for their new building that Father Norbert Woolfrey came to Grace Dieu in 1833.

In his conversations with Lisle Phillipps, the possibility of a similar foundation in England was discussed. There was something specially appropriate that the revival of monasticism in England should be bound up with the Cistercian Order, for that Order owed its origin in great measure to an Englishman —St. Stephen Harding; and one of the four great affiliations from Citeaux[1]—that at Pontigny—had been more than once closely connected with English history. For it was in the Cistercian monastery at Pontigny that St. Thomas à Becket took refuge from the anger of Henry II., and seventy years later another canonised Archbishop of Canterbury—St. Edmund—took similar refuge from Henry III. Again, St. Edmund died in France,[2] and his shrine in the Abbey church

[1] These were La Ferté (1113), Pontigny (1114), Clairvaux (1115), and Morimond (1115). The Abbots of these four together with the Abbot of Citeaux formed the General Chapter, which was one of the features of the Cistercian Order.

[2] At the Augustinian Priory of Soissy, near Provins, whither he had retired in search of a milder climate. His body was brought back to Pontigny for interment.

at Pontigny had become a place of pilgrimage for centuries; and although the Cistercian monastery came to an end during the Reign of Terror, the massive church escaped destruction and still stands, with the shrine of St. Edmund behind the high altar, a unique memorial of a saint of Catholic England.

Moreover, the Cistercian Order had always flourished in this country in a remarkable way. At the time of the suppression of the monasteries under Henry VIII. in 1535, over eighty of them belonged to that Order, which would thus appear to have been specially congenial to the English character.

Nevertheless, there was room for difference of opinion about the wisdom of devoting valuable time and energy to the revival of an Order which was purely contemplative. The need of missionaries was so great that to some it appeared wiser to concentrate all available means on providing clergy who would do more active work. There are certainly times and circumstances when such may be the case. It was the need of active priests which had caused in the past the English Benedictines to become practically a missionary congregation —a character which it has not even yet quite lost. In 1835 the majority of the monks never lived in their monastery once their novitiate was over, and although Downside and Ampleforth were both in a fairly flourishing condition, Mr. Phillipps often spoke as though there was no monasticism among the English Catholics. The same considerations held with respect to the English Friars. There were both Dominicans and Franciscans in England, but they were chiefly occupied with missionary work.

In view then of the crying need of active work amongst English Catholics, we find even Lord Shrewsbury hesitating in his encouragement of Lisle Phillipps's scheme. He had at first promised to imitate the proposed foundation on his own estate, but writing to Mr. Phillipps in September, 1836, he showed signs of changing his views:—[1]

"I am inclined to think that a Society of Brothers of Christian Instruction, with almshouses for the poor old people would be more useful than a regular monkery. What think you? I begin to repent of my promise, not that I do not wish,

[1] *Life*, i., p. 69.

nay ardently desire, to see a religious establishment on the premises; but I fancy we might have a much more useful one than a Trappist monastery."

Bishop Walsh also gave the scheme only a half-hearted support, though for a different reason. He was afraid that the sight of a Trappist monk would repel rather than attract the average Protestant, and tend to revive prejudice against Catholicism in general. He suggested that their life should be veiled as much as possible from the general public, proposing that they should be called an "agricultural and philanthropic community," and that the habit should never be worn outside the house. This latter had been the practice adopted by the French Trappists when they had been received at Lulworth during the Revolution. They occupied a farm-house, and when working in the fields they wore the dress of an ordinary agricultural labourer, covering their bald heads with worsted wigs.[1]

To Mr. Phillipps, however, this method of procedure was destructive of the whole idea he had in view. He wished to see the Catholic religion publicly proclaimed by the example of the monks, and he pointed to the Catholic idea of a life of prayer as the most potent instrument to be used for the conversion of England. He attributed the views of Dr. Walsh and those who felt like him to the timidity which he considered as characteristic of the old Catholics, of whom he as a convert had a low opinion. Writing to the Earl of Shrewsbury, he said plainly:[2] "You are the only Catholic almost in England with any public spirit, certainly the only one with any of the devotional generosity of ancient times—we must await awhile until the reunion of the Anglican Church has put a little new blood into our degenerate body, before we can expect such work as Abbey Churches to rise up".

In order to carry out his scheme, Mr. Lisle Phillipps bought a large tract of Charnwood Forest, amounting to over 200 acres, which he devoted to the purpose. The early members of the community came over from Meillerai, and took possession of a cottage in the Forest in the year 1835. The Prior was Father Odilo Woolfrey—brother of Father Norbert. Shortly afterwards Father Bernard Palmer came from Meillerai

[1] See *Dawn of Catholic Revival*, ii., p. 35. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

and joined the community, which then numbered nine members. They lived a life under Cistercian rule, giving themselves to prayer at night and to work during the day. By their labour they put up a temporary monastery and chapel, which latter was opened in 1837. Bishop Walsh pontificated on the occasion, and a sermon was preached by Rev. George Spencer, with whose conversion a few years before Mr. Lisle Phillipps had been closely concerned.

Mr. Phillipps was well pleased with the result of his undertaking during its early years. The monks christened their demesne "Mount St. Bernard," by which name it has become permanently known. In accordance with Cistercian rule, the primary dedication was to the Blessed Virgin.

The monks lived the life of Cistercians in its entirety. They rose every morning at two o'clock for Matins, followed by other exercises, till Mass, after which they worked in the fields or workshops until evening, observing a strict silence throughout the day. The sight of the white-robed figures working without speaking to one another was one which could not fail to attract curiosity in the midst of Protestant England, and visitors came from far and near to see the unwonted sight. On one day it was said that more than three hundred visitors came. But the monks continued their labour without heeding them, and the guest-master alone was allowed to speak with them.

At last Lord Shrewsbury became converted to the undertaking. He paid a visit in 1839, and was so impressed with all he saw that he gave £2,000 for the building of a new monastery, under the sole condition that it should be built on a site he had chosen. The condition was at once accepted, and Pugin was called in to draw the plans. Needless to say he entered into the scheme with enthusiasm, and designed a monastery and church on the lines of severe simplicity customary in the ancient abbeys of the Order. The building took several years to put up, and the church has never been completed; but as it stands to-day in its solid simplicity, with thick walls and lancet windows, it is a striking memorial of the aims and ideas of Pugin's mind, and of the solid work accomplished in those early days.

While, however, Bishop Walsh had given only a cautious

support to the establishment of Mount St. Bernard's, he himself was occupied with schemes which were not indeed so calculated to awaken controversy, but which had no less practical bearing on the end in view. These were two in number: the rebuilding of Oscott College, and the construction of a new church at Birmingham on a larger and more architectural scale than the "chapels" hitherto in use, to serve as a kind of Pro-Cathedral for his District, and to be accompanied by a new residence for himself. The second of these plans at first proved a failure, owing to the difficulty of selecting a site, and the rivalry between the two existing missions. The older of them, that of St. Peter, was well established with what was for those days a handsome and commodious chapel. Soon after the Franciscans, in whose hands it had originally been, surrendered it to the Bishop in 1824, and the care of it was undertaken by the Rev. Thomas M. McDonnell. He was a man of considerably more than average ability, but had a curiously difficult disposition, which afterwards drew him into unenviable notoriety. By the force of his character he made a position for himself in Birmingham among Protestants and Catholics alike. He was full of energy, and built a school and an orphanage in his parish. The mission of St. Chad, on the other hand, was of comparatively recent growth—it was founded by the Rev. Edward Peach in 1806—and stood sorely in need of a new church. Dr. Walsh's first idea was to build the new Cathedral there; but he realised that this would be placing St. Peter's henceforth in a secondary position. Hence he thought it more considerate to ask Mr. McDonnell to retire, and to offer him work elsewhere. This, however, Mr. McDonnell vehemently resented, and a petition against his removal having been presented by his parishioners, the Bishop gave way. The next idea was to build the new Cathedral in some central situation, and let it absorb both the parishes, St. Peter's and St. Chad's. In furtherance of this scheme a meeting was held at St. Peter's in January, 1834, presided over by Bishop Walsh, at which both Mr. McDonnell and Mr. Peach assisted. A joint Committee was formed, the secretary being Mr. John Hardman, the head of the well-known firm of that name, who was one of the "Chaddists" (as they became called); but very little progress was made. Mr. McDonnell raised con-

tinual difficulties, contending that it would be much more useful to the Birmingham Catholics to abandon the idea of a Cathedral, and devote their energies to establishing a third mission in the town. The Committee only met twice. It became evident that if the Cathedral was ever to be built, it would be in St. Chad's parish, but for the time the whole scheme was allowed to drop.

The work of rebuilding Oscott, however, was successfully accomplished. The President, the Rev. Henry Weedall, threw himself heart and soul into the scheme. A new site was purchased in 1835, some two miles from the old College, and it has since been known as "new Oscott". The work was entrusted to one Mr. Potter, an architect from Lichfield, recommended by Dr. Kirk. His designs were of the late or Tudor form of Gothic, and created a very favourable impression. There was a collegiate style about them to which Catholics were unaccustomed. To-day, with greater knowledge, we can see several faults of construction, the chief being that which Pugin used to describe as making the plan to suit the elevation instead of the reverse order which is the right course. As a result, the external arrangement of the windows does not correspond with the interior requirements, so that some rooms have too many windows, while others are hardly lighted at all. There is also a want of height about many of the rooms. It was, however, undoubtedly a great advance on any similar Catholic building of the period, and contains some notable excellences to atone for some of its defects. It is a remarkably compact building for its size, and in view of the purposes for which it was built, its design was both complete and well-proportioned.[1]

Nevertheless, before it was finished, Pugin had made his name, and the authorities began to regret that they had not secured his services from the beginning. Before the work was fully completed, Mr. Potter was somewhat unceremoniously dismissed, and Pugin was put in possession. Hence the interior fittings of the chapel were all added by him, and he likewise added the present sanctuary and apse. He also built a

[1] Those who see the College in use to-day should bear in mind that the purpose for which it is now employed—a Theological Seminary—differs widely from that for which it was originally constructed.

second gate-house or lodge, on the road to Sutton Coldfield, with a statue of our Lady facing the public road.

The opening of the new College chapel took place on May 31, 1838. It had been solemnly consecrated two days before. At the opening ceremony High Mass was sung by Bishop Walsh, in presence of Bishop Baines of the Western District, Bishop Briggs of the Northern, and upwards of seventy clergy. This was the first of the series of imposing ceremonies for which Oscott became famous. We may quote Pugin's own words on this head, in his reply to an address of thanks presented to him on behalf of the students when they had entered the new College a few months later :—[1]

"We have, indeed, in this place," he said, "advantages and incitements to zeal and devotion which are possessed by few other Catholics in this land. The whole building is of a venerable and collegiate character. The church in which we worship God is no ordinary edifice, hired or erected to suit the exigencies of the moment, but it has been set apart in a more particular manner for its sacred purpose. Most of you were witnesses to its solemn consecration a few months ago, and the devout and perfect manner in which all the beautiful ceremonies prescribed by the Church were performed must be deeply impressed on your recollections. Twelve times were its walls anointed by our venerable Bishop with the holy Chrism; thrice did the long procession wind round the exterior of the edifice, invoking the blessings of heaven, and sprinkling the foundations with lustral water. Beneath our consecrated altar are deposited the sacred remains of holy martyrs, who seventeen centuries ago suffered torments and death for that pure and holy faith which you have the unspeakable blessing to profess. The ornaments used here in the celebration of the holy mysteries and the sculptures which decorate our walls were for the most part executed by ancient artists in days of faith. Torn by heretical and revolutionary violence from their original position in the noble churches of France and Belgium, they have been with infinite pains collected on this spot, where secure from further profanation, they once more fulfil the object for which they were designed, by increasing the glory and splendour of religion.

[1] *Catholic Magazine*, November, 1838, p. 692.

And when I behold the priests of God again robed in the ample and dignified vestments which were anciently used in this land, and offering up the Eucharistic sacrifice at an altar whose style and decorations forcibly recall to mind the by-gone days of Catholic glory, and that too on a spot which but three years ago was a barren and uncultivated common, the regret which I should otherwise feel at our unjust exclusion from the noble buildings of our forefathers is infinitely diminished, as I am convinced that the ancient Catholic spirit being again awakened, we shall be enabled to triumph over the malice of our enemies, and raise edifices to rival the splendour of those which they have so shamefully desecrated and destroyed."

Pugin had already accepted the title of Professor of Ecclesiastical Architecture and Antiquities at Oscott. His first lecture was delivered on January 17, 1838—before the new College had been opened. Others followed from time to time, whenever he was able to visit the College. They were published in the *Catholic Magazine* at the time, and afterwards reissued in book form.[1] At each visit his heart rejoiced at seeing the ceremonies of the church carried out with completeness and full artistic effect. He took a personal interest in their organisation. He devoted particular attention to one ceremony which he considered the central feature of the ecclesiastical year. This was the change from Lent to Easter in the Mass on Holy Saturday, symbolical of the moment of the Resurrection. For the last fortnight, being "Passion-tide," the three windows of the apse have been closed by shutters from without, the consequent semi-darkness according with the sombre purple hue of the curtains which drape the reredos, and the purple frontal of the altar. For three days also, during the celebration of our Lord's death, the organ has been mute, the church bells have not sounded, and the faithful have been summoned to the functions in solemn silence. Now the moment has arrived for the priest to intone the Angelic canticle, *Gloria in excelsis*, which is to announce to all the accomplishment of the Resurrection. Immediately the bells ring, the organ peals, the purple curtains disappear from the altar, and shutters behind the windows falling back noiselessly,

[1] *The True Principles of Pointed or Christian Architecture* (Weale, 1841).

a bright light streams in to illuminate the beautiful painted reredos and altar, arrayed in festal garb.[1]

The arrangements for carrying out this instantaneous change, with proper ecclesiastical decorum, required much thought and skill to design. Here Pugin's experience of the mechanism of the theatrical stage came to his assistance. But he was only half satisfied with the result, and he is reported to have said that the change would never be satisfactorily carried out until he was allowed to make a design for the old purple altar to go down into the ground and a new festal altar to rise in its place.

The year after the opening of Oscott, Pugin completed the first two churches which were his own work throughout, both of which owed much to the generosity of the Earl of Shrewsbury. These were St. Marie's, Uttoxeter, and St. Marie's, Derby. The former of these was quite a small church, and is chiefly notable for Pugin's own description of it in the *Orthodox Journal*.[2] He calls it "The first Catholic structure erected in this country, in strict accordance with the rules of ancient ecclesiastical architecture, since the days of the pretended Reformation". He describes the "Sedilia" for the sacred ministers at High Mass, the Gothic holy water stoup near the door, and the stone "sacrarium" and shelf for the cruets, all of which were new features so far as English Catholics were concerned; and also the arch supporting the rood, which replaced the usual altar rails, though without anything which could be called a screen. But perhaps the most remarkable feature of the whole church was the change in the arrangements for reserving the Blessed Sacrament. "There is not a tabernacle, on the altar," he wrote, "which is left entirely free for sacrifice; but the Blessed Sacrament, according to an ancient and formerly general practice, will be suspended over the altar in a pyx, enclosed within a silver dove, surrounded by rays of glory."[3]

[1] On one occasion Miss Lucy Gladstone, sister of William Ewart Gladstone and a convert, so far rose to the occasion that she came to the service in a large cloak of dark hue, which she wore through the first half of the ceremony; then, at the critical moment, when the *Gloria in excelsis* was intoned, she threw it off, displaying her dress of bright and varied colours, in honour of the Resurrection.

[2] July 20, 1839, p. 33.

[3] One of these silver doves can still be seen hanging before the high altar in the Cathedral at Amiens, though it is not now in use.

St. Mary's, Derby

The opening of St. Marie's, Derby, attracted much more attention, as it was a church of considerable dimensions, and a great advance on anything which had preceded it. Pugin chose the perpendicular style as the most characteristically English, adding a lofty and noble tower. At Derby, as in several of his early churches, he built an apse at the far end; but his taste for East windows—a characteristic feature of English as opposed to French Gothic—soon developed itself, and many of his best churches were built with a square end.

One feature of the opening of the new church at Derby was to have been the valuable set of cloth-of-gold vestments presented to the Bishop by the Earl of Shrewsbury, and intended to be used at the opening of all new churches.[1] These, like the Oscott vestments, were made to a new pattern designed by Pugin to resemble those of mediaeval times. The chasuble, however, was less full than those which had formerly been in use, as a concession to modern ideas of convenience. The pattern has been largely followed at different times, and such vestments are commonly, though not quite accurately, designated as Gothic. Pugin succeeded at different times in obtaining some valuable specimens of real mediaeval crosses worked in tapestry on similar material, and had them made up into vestments of the new pattern, the silk being of course new. Many of these are still to be seen in various of his churches now standing. From the very beginning, however, a certain number of people took offence at the novelty of their appearance, and they afterwards became the cause of much heated controversy.[2] He also revived the old Northern form of surplice, full and flowing, which contrasted greatly with the French small and sleeveless pattern then commonly in vogue, and this also led to controversy and discussion.

In the event, however, at the opening of St. Marie's, Derby, the Shrewsbury vestments were not used, owing to an untoward incident, which caused a most unfortunate impression. It appears that Pugin had understood that the Mass

[1] These vestments are now kept at Oscott, and used on great occasions.

[2] It should be remembered that the vestments which Pugin sought to displace were not Roman, but French. At that date there was hardly a single Roman vestment in the country.

was to be sung to Gregorian chant by a surpliced choir, and he arrived with the Earl of Shrewsbury and Mr. Lisle Phillipps, looking forward to seeing for the first time in England a real mediaeval High Mass, which was to show to some of his friends from Oxford the full Catholic ritual in the surroundings of Gothic architecture and vestments. What was their dismay when on their arrival they found a full orchestra in possession, and a large choir, including females, in accordance with the custom of the day. Pugin protested in vain. Bishop Walsh was in the sacristy, ready vested, and said that it was too late to alter the arrangements. Pugin appealed to the Earl of Shrewsbury, and not altogether without success. Being the donor of the vestments, he declared that they should not be used if there were to be lady sopranos and fiddlers. The Bishop, however, was inexorable; so he exchanged his beautiful cloth-of-gold vestments for a dingy set of the French pattern, and the service proceeded. The three distinguished visitors drove away in high dudgeon, and took no part in the opening ceremony.

To Pugin, indeed, the reform of church music and church vestments was an integral part of the restoration of mediaeval art. He looked upon the form and pattern of the vestments as one of the most potent forces to act upon our Protestant fellow-countrymen. "How can you expect to convert England if you use a cope like that?" was one of his well-known sayings.[1] Hence when the Holy See, in 1839, on the strength of various unauthorised rumours, wrote to Dr. Walsh deprecating the new form of vestments, Pugin felt that a heavy blow had fallen on him. It was not known definitely who the complainants had been; but it is not improbable that Bishop Baines was one, for he had strong feelings on the whole subject of Pugin's reforms. Writing a year later he expressed himself as follows:—

"Under the pretext of diminishing the objections which Protestants have to a connection with Rome, it was proposed to re-establish the ceremonial of the ancient Church of England. For this purpose the form of the sacred vestments was

[1] This story has been told and re-told, and referred to so many different persons that it is impossible to ascertain to whom the words were originally addressed by Pugin.

altered to what it was supposed to have been four or five centuries ago, and so entirely did these new vestments differ from those in use throughout the whole Latin Church as to be no longer recognisable as of the same genus. The Chasuble, being nearly six feet in width, hung in ample folds before and behind, and nearly resembled a large shawl. The Communion rail was omitted in the new churches, even at the Communion altar; the Tabernacle was to be removed from the altar, and the Blessed Sacrament suspended from the ceiling by a chain or cord in a silver dove."[1]

When the notice about the vestments came, both Lisle Phillipps and Pugin were filled with dismay. The former wrote to Lord Shrewsbury as follows:—[2]

"It is with deep concern that I learnt from our good Bishop, as well as from Pugin, that Propaganda have judged it proper to send a letter to Dr. Walsh, condemnatory of the restoration of our old English vestments, taking the same occasion to speak in terms not only of censure but I might even say of reprobation of our zealous Bishop for having adopted Pugin's advice relative to the vestments. That Propaganda has been grossly and fraudulently deceived as to the real facts of the case, no one can doubt who looks at the terms in which its censure to the Bishop has been conveyed; and that Propaganda will not hesitate to retract that censure as soon as it has received a true statement of facts, my conviction of the rectitude, justice, and prudence of the court of Rome clearly convinces me—but it is of the utmost importance that this statement should be made as soon as possible. . . . I regard this censure as the death-blow to the Catholic cause in England if persisted in."

Pugin himself in a letter to Lisle Phillipps wrote characteristically:—[3]

"The censure has been procured by the influence of some English Catholic, and I fear Ecclesiastic. In this censure the Bishop is accused of having at *my* instigation introduced various *innovations* in the Liturgy and vestments. Intolerable ignorance, these innovations, as they are called, are the mere restoration of the glorious ornaments which the ascendancy of

[1] *Letter to Cardinal Fransoni*, p. 8.
[2] *Life of Ambrose de Lisle*, ii., p. 219.
[3] *Ibid.*, ii., p. 223.

heretics had deprived us of, and because those who ought to *delight in the study of these things are utterly ignorant of them*, we are to be denounced as *innovators*. Mark my word. Your chapel service, which is perhaps the most devotional in England, will be shortly put down because it is different from what has been lately seen in the scrubby rooms called chapels, where *one urchin* is frequently the only assistant at the Holy Sacrifice, which is offered up in a place and at an altar far more calculated to excite ridicule than devotion. I am sick at heart. The apathy of the Catholic body on these things is alarming. I had formed dreams of returning glory; but if this censure of the Propaganda is persisted in after the remonstrance which has been sent, I shall abandon all my hopes. I see everything we had hoped dashed to pieces. Do not deceive yourself, my dear Friend, do not deceive yourself; the Catholics will cut their own throats, the clergy will put down religion. These are hard sayings, but they are twice mad fools; straining at gnats, and swallowing camels, the very men who do not hesitate to violate rubrics every day to suit their convenience or their pockets, now swelling with indignation and horror at the idea of an ample surplice, or flowing chasuble such as almost every saint in the Calendar wore. Administer Baptism out of an old physic phial; reserve the Blessed Sacrament in an old *dirty cupboard;* say Mass in a vestment made out of an old gown; burn gas on the altar; have everything as *mean*, as *pitiful*, as *shabby* as you please; hire Protestant performers to sing; *leave out every ceremony in the Ritual;* do all this, and you will be right. But if you venture to speak of ancient glory, and ecclesiastical dignity, oh, you are a man of extravagant opinions, an enthusiast, a visionary;—and *ecclesiastical censure* awaits you."

Fortunately for Pugin no censure was actually promulgated, and for the time being Gothic vestments were tolerated.

During the next few years Pugin's heart was gladdened by the revival of Dr. Walsh's scheme for a new and worthy church at Birmingham, the designing of which was eventually committed to his care.[1] Shortly afterwards London followed the example, and the Rev. Thomas Doyle's scheme for St. George's,

[1] The first plans had been drawn out by Rickman, the style being a kind of Gothic; but when Pugin came on the scene, Rickman was dismissed.

Southwark, took shape. And gradually Pugin saw his influence spreading. At Reading he built a church on part of the site of the old Abbey, which had been acquired by the Catholics. Other churches were planned up and down the country; at Liverpool and Manchester and Nottingham and Newcastle-on-Tyne and elsewhere; and his services were called for in Ireland, where he designed the Cathedral at Killarney, and another at Enniscorthy. There was, in fact, a regular movement in favour of the revived art of church building. "Mr. Pugin is now actively engaged amidst a press of other business," writes the Editor of the *Catholic Magazine*,[1] "in preparing drawings for several Catholic chapels, to be commenced forthwith, or early in the ensuing Spring. . . . Some of the plans we have seen, and we express ourselves very inadequately when we say that they delight us much. The pictures give features of the designs; their chasteness, their simplicity, but above all, their *Catholicity*, make us long to see some of our present chapels replaced by others of his erection. The style of the new edifice at Reading will be Norman, as best suiting the situation, being contiguous to the ruins of an ancient abbey; the others are to be built, we believe, in the early pointed style of Germany, which is used in preference to the corresponding style of our own country, because it may be made to produce a much richer effect with a great deal less money."

These churches, however, for the most part belong to a somewhat later period. We shall conclude this chapter with the account of what was to Pugin an event of personal importance and intense domestic joy. This was the conversion of his wife. By the permission of the Earl of Shrewsbury, the ceremony of her reception into the Church took place at Alton Towers, and was carried out by Dr. Rock in full imitation of the ethos of such a ceremony in the days of Catholic England. As an exposition of his aims and aspirations, the following account, taken from the *Staffordshire Examiner*, is worth giving in full:—[2]

"On Wednesday the 8th of May [1839], on the festival of the glorious Archangel St. Michael, Mrs. Pugin, wife of the celebrated architect, A. Welby Pugin, Esq., made a public

[1] January, 1838, p. 709.

[2] It is quoted in the *Catholic Magazine* for July, 1839, p. 498.

recantation of the errors of Protestantism, and a solemn profession of the Catholic faith, in the Chapel of St. Peter's at Alton Towers, near Cheadle. The ceremony was grand, and awfully impressive. Agreeably to ancient Catholic custom in this island and to the present practice of the Church in Catholic countries, the aisle of the sacred edifice was bestrewed with odoriferous flowers and evergreens, emblematic of the sweetness and never-fading beauty of the heavenly Zion. From either extremity of the side galleries was extended across the chapel a handsome and tasty festoon of flowerets, from the centre of which was suspended a crown of the same materials directly over the head of the convert. At the appointed hour, as the full organ poured forth in majestic note, the Rev. Dr. Rock as priest, attended by the Rev. Messrs. Morgan and Fairfax as deacon and subdeacon, walked in solemn procession from the sacristy to the sanctuary, preceded by the thurifers, acolytes, and torch-bearers. Their vestments were of the richest gold brocade. A grand High Mass was then sung, with all the usual inexpressibly affecting ceremonies of the Catholic Church. Immediately after the Gospel, Dr. Rock exchanged his superb Chasuble for a splendid Cope, robed with which he, at the foot of the altar, intoned the first words of the hymn to the Holy Ghost, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, in the old Salisbury chant, which the choir continued with impressive effect. At the conclusion of the hymn the Rev. Celebrant recited the psalm *Miserere*, with the versicles and responses according to the Roman Ritual. The subdeacon then lighted a large wax taper, ornamented in the style of the fifteenth century, which from its beauty merits a particular description. It arose out of a bouquet of rare exotic flowers. Around the lower part of this candle were rolled three labels, written in Gothic characters, with the following ejaculations: *Jesu, fili Dei, miserere mei; O mater filii Dei memento mei; Sancte Michael ora pro me.* The higher part was ornamented with a wreath of flowers, in brilliant colours, above which, attached by a golden string, was suspended a small Gothic label upon the richly diapered ground of which was emblazoned in the style of the fifteenth century the Archangel St. Michael overcoming Satan. Supported on his right and left by the deacon and subdeacon Dr. Rock placed this beautiful taper in

the hand of Mrs. Pugin, who with this emblem of faith and an edifying life before her, read in the presence of the officiating ministers, and a large body of spectators, her recantation of Protestantism, and her profession of the Catholic creed. The Rev. Dr. Rock afterwards addressed a short but eloquent and applicable discourse to her, portraying the figurative signification of the flowers, the wreath, the lighted candle, and the blaze of wax tapers crowding the altar, which he represented as denoting the beauty of the heavenly paradise, the splendour of the crown of glory awarded to the just, and the admonition of our Redeemer in the Gospel, 'let your light so shine before men, that others seeing your good works may glorify God, your heavenly Father'.[1] He congratulated her on coming to Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the company of many thousands of angels, and to the church of the first-born, who are written in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of the just made perfect. He congratulated her on her return to the bosom of that Church which had been the foster-mother of all the saints who had ever lived throughout the Christian world, and he exhorted her to show by her example much more than by her words that she was Catholic in heart as well as in profession. The celebration of the High Mass was then continued in the usual majestic manner. The *Te Deum* was chanted by the choir at the conclusion, and a solemn benediction was pronounced by the Celebrant over the deeply affected convert, whose mind and soul seemed wholly absorbed with the momentous proceedings in which she was taking so prominent a part."

[1] St. Matt. v. 16.

CHAPTER VIII.

EPISCOPAL NEGOTIATIONS.

ONLY a few months had elapsed after the death of Bishop Bramston before the first definite step was taken in the long negotiations which were to lead to the restoration of the hierarchy. The initiative came from the Northern District, where the clergy were known to be in a state of unrest, and to be discussing the possibility of a change in ecclesiastical discipline. The state of things which had been provided for by the *Regula Missionis* of Benedict XIV. had, they contended, completely passed away, and a more suitable definition of the relations between the clergy and their Bishops was urgently called for.

A petition was accordingly drawn up, to be presented to the Pope, embodying their views.[1] In this petition no mention was made of the possibility of having Bishops in Ordinary; but the measures asked for would appear to have been shaped towards that end. These were three. One was that the number of Bishops might be increased; another that the clergy might have some voice in the election of their own future episcopal superiors; and the third was that in each District there should be set up a Chapter, whose business it should be to draw out a new canonical code.

Some months passed away, and considerable further discussion took place before the petition was accepted by the clergy; but it was eventually sent to Rome in the spring of 1837. In the meantime, the Vicars Apostolic at their meeting which began on January 25, 1837, themselves took the matter into consideration. At this time the number of

[1] See *Orthodox Journal*, November, 1836, p. 364.



Bishop Briggs

Bishops in England was once more reduced to four. Dr. Penswick had succeeded to the Northern District on the death of Bishop Smith on July 30, 1831 ; and acting on the latter's dying advice, had lost no time in asking for a Coadjutor, in order to safeguard the succession, and provide against the possibility of an interregnum. Dr. Briggs, the President of Ushaw, was duly appointed by Rome, and for a while he discharged the double office ; when, however, Dr. Penswick died on January 28, 1836, Dr. Briggs resigned the Presidency and took up his residence at Fulford House, York. He was a native of Manchester, and, like Dr. Griffiths, he had been educated entirely in England—at Crook Hall and Ushaw—and he ruled the District without a Coadjutor.

Of the others both Dr. Walsh and Dr. Baines had at different times asked for a Coadjutor, but apparently in view of anticipated re-arrangements in the episcopal government of the country, the Holy See thought it wiser to postpone any appointments for the time.

Accordingly, the Bishops who assembled in January, 1837, were Dr. Walsh, Dr. Baines, Dr. Griffiths, and Dr. Briggs. As the result of their deliberations, it was decided to prepare a plan to be discussed at their meeting in the following year ; and at the same time it was also agreed to hold the annual meeting of Bishops—as it had now become—in Low week, a custom which has continued down to the present day. This gave them fifteen months to think over the matter of the division of the Districts before taking any action.

It would appear that news of the unrest among the clergy reached Rome ; and at the same time the success of Dr. Wiseman's lectures in London, and the number of Protestants who attended them was also reported. It was perhaps natural that an exaggerated idea should have been formed of the progress of conversions, and as a consequence, it was thought that some development in the ecclesiastical government was called for. When Dr. Wiseman returned from England in time for the opening of the schools in the autumn of 1836, he found the whole question in the air. In a letter to Dr. Griffiths, dated February 15, 1837, he writes as follows :—[1]

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

"My dear Lord,

"I feel it my duty immediately to trouble you, in consequence of the information which this letter will communicate. I will treat the matter, as is my wont, historically.

"I had scarcely been a few days in Rome before I discovered that a much livelier interest prevailed here regarding England than I had before noticed. But what particularly struck me was having the same question put to me by three or four persons, if some change were not about to be made in the number of vicariates, or even in the form of ecclesiastical government. This led me to suppose that something of this nature had been spoken of in a high quarter, and the knowledge I had of similar ideas having been often expressed in England, and of a declaration to that effect having been made by a large portion of the clergy of the Northern District, suggested the propriety of searching the matter further.

"I found no difficulty in this, for in my first conversation with Mgr. Mai, I scarcely hinted at the subject before he entered fully into it. He told me that the Pope had a short time before spoken to him on the propriety of increasing the number of Bishops in England, and had expressed an earnest wish respecting such a measure, adding, however, that he did not like proposing it, as a former effort at a new division (without an increase of numbers) had not succeeded,[1] and he feared dissensions might be bred by the proposal. Mai desired me to do everything in my power to promote his Holiness's wishes, so that their fulfilment should originate from your Lordships. I did not write immediately, because I wished still further to look into the matter.

"About Christmas a gentleman got into conversation with Cardinal Fransoni, who made no difficulty in saying to him, though a layman, all that Mai had observed to me, and even went much further by stating that the Pope's desire was to have a hierarchy in England. Upon this being communicated to me, I took an early opportunity of again calling upon Mai. He said that the latter plan had never been debated at Propaganda, that it would be a matter of serious deliberation, from political motives, as it might meet with opposition from the Government, but that it would meet with no opposition here,

[1] See Appendix C.

as Rome ever considered Vicars Apostolic only in the light of a temporary arrangement when Bishops could not be established, but a hierarchy as the true normal government of the Church. He again repeated that though he did not think the time had come for this alteration (on political grounds), he was quite clear as to the propriety of England's containing more than four districts. As Dr. Walsh intends visiting Rome after Easter, and your Lordship had expressed an intention of doing the same at a future period, and as I saw that the matter would be proposed to him, I suggested the idea of your making the journey together. Mgr. Mai said he had no doubt such a plan would be most advisable, and expressed a wish that I should speak with the Pope on the entire matter.

"This was what I desired, and I obtained an audience in the evening. The Pope made me sit down, and kept me upwards of an hour talking to me about England. He expressed himself most strongly on the subject of the propriety of increasing the number of Bishops. He spoke of Dr. Walsh's intended visit with great pleasure, and said he wished the other Bishops would also make it a point to come to Rome, observing what a number of Irish and American Bishops have come, but none from England. This he said he would wish were there no other reason, for the sake of keeping up the connexion with the Holy See. I said your Lordship and Dr. Briggs looked forward to having the pleasure, and he expressed a desire that your Lordship's visit should be, if possible, at the same time with Dr. Walsh, to treat of the matter I have mentioned. The Pope expressed himself as much hurt that neither Dr. Bramston nor Dr. Penswick had ever answered his letter written in reply to the one signed by the Bishops.

"All this I think it right to transmit to your Lordship, the more so because the Pope and Cardinal Fransoni have spoken on the subject with others, as that it certainly will be heard in England, and may increase the uneasiness which exists, especially in the Northern District, respecting a new division. Should your Lordship, after communicating on the subject with your brethren, think it right to gratify his Holiness's desire, you may easily accomplish it in a very short time, and at very small cost. . . . Your Lordship would be

accommodated in the College, and I am sure would not have reason to repent your journey.[1]

"I am, my dear Lord,

"Yours very sincerely,

"N. WISEMAN."

Dr. Griffiths lost no time in communicating this letter to the other Vicars Apostolic, and by their request, he accepted Dr. Wiseman's suggestion, and determined to accompany Dr. Walsh to Rome. The commission given to the two Bishops was in the first place to ascertain the mind of the Holy Father on the whole question of the ecclesiastical government in England; and secondly to beg that whatever steps should be determined on should be discussed between the Holy See and the Vicars Apostolic only, so as to avoid increasing the unrest among the clergy and others until the time should come for action.

Dr. Walsh and Dr. Griffiths accordingly set out after Easter. They left London on Thursday, April 13, in a blinding snowstorm. The following day they crossed the Channel, landing at Boulogne, and proceeding on their journey—the ground being still covered with snow—they arrived in Paris in time for High Mass on Sunday, April 16. After a few days' rest they went forward in milder weather, and reached Lyons on April 24. On their arrival they learnt of the death of Cardinal Weld, which took place on the 10th.[2] He had outlived his daughter, Lady Clifford, by seven years, and it is said that his own death was hastened by his continuous works of charity. The funeral took place at the church of Santa Maria Aquiro in which parish he died; but his remains were laid to rest alongside those of his daughter in the church of St. Marcellus, from which he had derived his Cardinalitial title. The funeral sermon was preached by Dr. Wiseman.

The loss of Cardinal Weld would have been felt at any time; it was particularly unfortunate at that exact moment,

[1] As an interesting sidelight on the methods of travelling in those days, when systematic services of steam-packets were already established on the chief French rivers, we may add Dr. Wiseman's recommendation:—

"The only land travelling need be from Boulogne to Paris, and from Musteron to Chalons, all the rest by sea and rivers to Civita Vecchia."

[2] The date of Cardinal Weld's death has often been given as April 19. The date in the text, however, is that given in the contemporary records.

as the Bishops were looking to his help in the negotiations on which they were coming. It also left the office of Cardinal Protector of the English College vacant, and it became necessary to find a successor thereto.

Without further delay the two Bishops proceeded on their journey, crossed the Alps by the pass of Mount Cenis, and arrived in Rome on Saturday, May 13, the vigil of Pentecost.

A diary of their stay in Rome was kept by Bishop Griffiths, from which we can learn all particulars of their movements.[1] After a formal call on Cardinal Fransoni, as Prefect of Propaganda, they had a short audience of the Pope on the eve of Trinity Sunday, May 20, just before Papal Vespers. They were received with all cordiality, and the Pope forthwith created them "Assistants at the Pontifical Throne," in which quality they assisted at High Mass the following day.

After this their business proceeded slowly. They saw Cardinal Fransoni the Prefect of Propaganda, and Mgr. Mai, the secretary. The latter showed considerable interest in their affairs, and told them that their proper course would be to present a memorial to the Pope for the restoration of the hierarchy. This, however, they thought would be going beyond their authorisation, which puzzled Mai, and he asked what they had come to Rome for. They accordingly explained their position, and their anxiety that all negotiations should be carried on between the Vicars Apostolic and the Holy See.

After many delays, at length on June 12 the Holy Father received the two Bishops in audience. Dr. Wiseman accompanied them to act as interpreter. The audience was a long one. Dr. Griffiths sums up the substance of what was said as follows:—

"The Holy Father evidently did not wish to restore the hierarchy at present. [He] expressed his fears lest the English Government should interfere in the nomination of the Bishops, as they had interfered with regard to an Irish Archbishop.[2] Though not wishing to originate the further division of

[1] This diary is now among the *Westminster Archives*.

[2] This probably refers to Dr. Curtis, who was appointed Archbishop of Armagh in 1818 by the influence of the Duke of Wellington. See the *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, iii., p. 80.

England into Districts, he approved and sanctioned a further division, saying that as the number of Catholics increased, there was cause for an increase of Bishops to govern them. His Holiness wished the Vicars Apostolic at their meeting after Easter, 1838, to make every arrangement, except the name of Bishops-in-Ordinary, which they judged proper for the present state of the English Catholics. He expressed his approbation of the present mode of nominating Coadjutors, spoke of Chapters for the election of Bishops, referred to the Irish mode of electing, but repeated more than once that there was no obstacle with himself to the placing England in every respect, saving the name of Bishops-in-Ordinary, in the same situation with Catholic countries."

In a subsequent audience, when Dr. Griffiths was present alone, the Holy Father alluded to the want of respect which the English Bishops were considered to have shown during the last few years. Dr. Griffiths sums up what was said in very few words:—

"The Pope complained of the joint letter of the Vicars Apostolic on the subject of St. John's Wood, etc., but particularly of the silence of Bishops Bramston and Penswick when he had answered it. Bishop Griffiths observed that it was not known that private acts of his Holiness were the subjects of complaint in the VV. A.'s letter, and that indisposition was one cause of Bishop Bramston's silence. His Holiness appeared satisfied."

It remained to settle several points of business, chief among which was the election of a new Cardinal Protector of the English College. Having communicated with their colleagues in England, the Bishops petitioned for Cardinal Giustiniani, who has been already alluded to as having narrowly escaped the Papacy at the previous Conclave. In view of his connection with English families, the appointment would, they said, be specially appropriate; and on being nominated by the Pope, he consented to accept the office.

Having completed their business, the two Bishops had a farewell audience of the Pope on July 12, and setting out on the 17th, travelled via Bologna, Modena, Parma, Milan, Domo d'Ossola, and across the Simplon Pass to Geneva, from whence

they proceeded to Paris, and from thence to London, where they arrived on August 18.

The rest of the year passed without incident so far as the question of the ecclesiastical government was concerned, but the Bishops were by no means idle. A proposed episcopal meeting was abandoned, lest it should cause excitement among the clergy; but much correspondence passed between the four Vicars Apostolic, in which they expressed their views freely.

Dr. Griffiths himself was always in favour of the full measure of the restoration of the hierarchy.

"My own ideas," he writes,[1] "are that Bishops-in-Ordinary with an Archbishop at our head, would be preferable—because clergy and laity desire it; regulations and duties could be more easily enforced; Religion would gain in splendour and notoriety; and if deferred, Government may perhaps interfere later in the nomination of our Bishops. His Holiness is averse at present, but for reasons which, with all respect, should prompt us to adopt the change at present, as everything could be quietly arranged whilst the Government pays no attention to our names or duties."

"If this cannot be accomplished," he adds, "I should think that even retaining our present names, the Government of our country should be as much as possible assimilated to the regular hierarchy."

Without informing his clergy as a body of what was in contemplation, he wrote privately to the most influential among them, asking their views on the matter. He reports that "No two have answered alike, though most agree that a change of some kind is desirable". Perhaps the opinion of greatest weight was that of Rev. Mark Tierney, the learned editor of *Dodd's Church History*, who by his historical studies was well qualified to form an opinion. He wrote as follows:—[2]

"I own that the subject to which you refer has long engaged my anxious meditations. The restoration of the hierarchy amongst us has been the point to which most of my aspirations and many of my prayers have been directed. If on the one hand I have felt with Dodd that its former extinction

[1] To one of his colleagues: see letter in *Westminster Archives*.
[2] *Westminster Archives*.

was the ruin of the Church in this country, on the other I have thought with many enlightened men of the present day that its resuscitation would be the means of giving splendour and permanence to the religion that still survives. I have felt, too, that it was calculated to unite the clergy more intimately in one common bond to make them sensible of an identity of interest in all that concerns us, to divest them consequently of that selfishness (I speak as one less wise) which those who have lived much amongst them cannot fail to have observed, and thus to combine and concentrate their efforts on the one great cause in which we are all engaged. From this sketch of my views the general bearing of my replies to your enquiries will easily be gathered.

"With us I conceive the restoration of the hierarchy, or in other words the return from an extraordinary to an ordinary form of government, must in a great measure resolve itself into a mere question of time. Is the present a fit time for introducing the important change? is a question which I have often asked myself; and the more I have reflected and the more I have enquired, the more satisfied have I felt that it must be answered in the affirmative. I think that the time has arrived for reverting to the original permanent and ordinary form of Church government: and I think so (1) because there is a growing uneasiness in the minds of the clergy on the subject of our present missionary character; (2) because the same feeling is spreading among the laity, and has often, in my own hearing, been strongly, I would almost say bitterly expressed by some of the highest of their order; and (3) because in the character and disposition of the present Government, as well as in the very nature of the change I am advocating, there is everything to secure us against the consequences of external opposition."

He guards this last reason, however, by adding, as Dr. Griffiths himself had done, "however we may calculate on the temper of the Government and the real object of the change, when properly understood, the measure should be introduced *quietly*, not ostentatiously. There should be no public or outward demonstration. In fact it should be not so much a change, as a silent and almost imperceptible transition."

He then proceeds to discuss what should be done if the restoration of the full hierarchy could not be effected. "Your Lordship asks me," he says, "whether if the hierarchy cannot be restored, we should assimilate our form of government to that of the hierarchy. My answer must depend on the nature and extent of that assimilation. If any real substantial good can be effected by such a process, I say by all means assimilate. But if the measure is to involve a change and nothing more, or if only a trifling advantage is to be derived from the alteration, then I say it would be unwise to adopt it. We should in that case confessedly gain little, while at the same time we should *pro tanto* weaken our argument in favour of our ultimate object."

In the remainder of the letter Tierney discusses the position of the parish priests, the establishment of whom in some form he regards as an integral part of any proposed scheme, and the method of appointment of Bishops, which he thinks should be by an election of some kind on the part of the parish priests or senior clergy.

In the meantime Dr. Griffiths, who from his position naturally took the lead, had drawn up a scheme embodying what he believed to be the ideas of the Holy See, and sent a copy to each of the other Bishops in the month of January, 1838, for their comments, so that it might form a basis of discussion; and at the appointed time, after Easter, the four Vicars Apostolic assembled at Fulford House, York, to discuss the whole matter.

The meeting lasted from April 23 to May 4—twelve days, all but the last being given to the question we are considering. With respect to increasing the number of Vicariates, the Bishops unanimously passed a resolution that "It is highly desirable as soon as it can prudently be done; but it must needs be postponed for a time until certain obstacles have either been removed or come to an end". In the official minutes the nature of these obstacles is not stated; but from the letters of the Bishops, they would seem to have had regard to the difficulty of raising means to support the additional Prelates, as well as of finding suitable men for the posts. In other words, the Bishops considered that the time was not yet ripe for the change.

They then proceeded to discuss the advisability of providing new rules for the mission, to supplant those based on the Bull of Benedict XIV. Dr. Walsh and Dr. Griffiths reported that the Pope had said, "that there would be no objection on his part to assimilate the ecclesiastical government of the Catholics of England to that of Bishops-in-Ordinary, although from existing circumstances he objected to the name". Acting accordingly on this advice, the Vicars Apostolic devoted their attention to drawing up a new system based on the scheme of Dr. Griffiths, but with considerable modifications. To these regulations they gave the name of "Statuta Provisoria,"[1] or Provisional Statutes, indicating by this—as Dr. Ullathorne points out—that they were not intended to be permanent, but rather to pave the way, and lay a foundation on which statutes could be canonically established when the time came to set up a regular hierarchy. They provided that the Vicars Apostolic should retain their existing powers as to granting faculties revocable at will;[2] that there should be one Vicar General in each District, and as many Vicars Foran as seemed advisable, as well as a certain number of Archdeacons; that in every mission where there were several priests, one should be appointed Rector, with spiritual and temporal responsibility, and the others should be his assistants or "curates" as they are now commonly called; and that in each District there should be a Chapter consisting of at least five, and at most twelve Canons. The duties of the Canons were to be to advise the Bishop; to govern the diocese *sede vacante;* and to take part in the election of a Vicar Apostolic or Coadjutor. The method of election was to be as follows. The Canons were to choose three names and send them to Rome. They were also to send them to the Senior Vicar Apostolic, who would call his colleagues together, and draw up an independent *terna*, including or not the same names, as they should think fit; and

[1] See Appendix E. Dr. Ullathorne seems to suppose (*Hierarchy*, p. 17) that the "Statuta Provisoria" of the Vicars Apostolic were identical with the "Statuta Proposita" drawn up in Rome shortly afterwards, to be mentioned presently. Both are printed in full in Appendix E. It will be seen that they are quite distinct documents, and do not bear more than a general resemblance to one another.

[2] This involved that priests could be removed from one mission to another at the will of the Bishops.

the Holy See was to select a Bishop out of one of the two lists.

On the last day of the meeting, the Bishops drew up a joint circular to the clergy of all the four Districts, calling attention to various points in the *Apostolicum Ministerium* of Benedict XIV., as well as to certain resolutions passed by the Vicars Apostolic at their previous meetings since the beginning of the century, some of which were printed on every priest's "faculties". The title which they gave to the circular—*Monita et Statuta*—seemed to imply that it included some new regulations, which, strictly speaking, was not the case. The regulations were simple and practical. One was to require uniformity throughout the country in the English prayers which it was customary to say before or after Mass on Sundays. Another was to prohibit the singing of English Vespers, which had come into use in the last decade of the eighteenth century, in the days of the Catholic Committee and the Cisalpine Club. Another gave certain details of the law of abstinence, and the like. Attention was also called to the limitation of Indulgences which in other countries were administered by religious orders, but which in England were suppressed by the *Apostolicum Ministerium* in favour of those in the administration of the Vicars Apostolic. The Bishops looked on all these regulations as merely an agreement among themselves, to provide for uniformity in the different Districts. It probably did not occur to them to send them to Rome for confirmation before promulgating them. This indeed had never been done on similar occasions in the past. For example, when the Observanda were first issued, after the Synod of Winchester and Old Hall, in 1803, Dr. Poynter had suggested sending them to Rome, but the other Bishops decided that it was not necessary, and no fault had ever been found with their decision. Unfortunately, in the present case, the action of the Bishops in this regard proved an additional source of misunderstanding between themselves and the Holy See, as we shall soon find.

After the meeting had broken up the Vicars Apostolic proceeded in a leisurely way, and some weeks elapsed before they sent the result of their deliberations on the ecclesiastical re-organisation of the country to Rome. In the meantime the Holy Father was becoming impatient, and inquired more than

once when the scheme of the English Vicars Apostolic was to be expected. At length on May 19, 1838, four weeks after they were known to have met—Cardinal Fransoni wrote a short formal letter to Dr. Griffiths, stating that petitions had reached Rome for the increase of the number of Bishops and for a new method of election in which the clergy should have a voice, and asking for the opinion of the Vicars Apostolic on the matter. In reply, a letter was drawn out and signed by all the four Vicars Apostolic, under date June 11, 1838, saying that they had discussed the question for eleven whole days, and had drawn out the *Statuta Provisoria*, a copy of which they enclosed. And when they had done this, they appear to have thought that their decision would be accepted without further question, and that the whole matter would be shelved, at any rate for the time being.

This, however, was far from being the intention of the Holy See; and the consequent and somewhat unfortunate development of the negotiations which resulted must be followed out in some detail in order to enable us to understand the position of affairs. This will be considered in the following chapter.

CHAPTER IX.

MISUNDERSTANDINGS WITH ROME.

THE delay of the Vicars Apostolic in sending a report of their meeting about the proposed changes in ecclesiastical government created an unfavourable impression in Rome. There were persons there who were accusing them of being wanting in zeal for the spread of religion, and their long silence was interpreted as indicating that these accusations were not wholly without foundation. The following letter from Dr. Wiseman to Bishop Baines will serve to indicate the state of feeling among the Roman authorities on the matter:—[1]

"ROME, 24 *June*, 1838.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"I take the liberty of writing to your Lordship in common with all the Vicars Apostolic, in consequence of the uneasiness expressed to me by the Secretary of Propaganda, Mgr. Cadolini, at not having heard from your Lordships since the meeting at York, upon the subjects proposed for deliberation. He gave me to understand that new petitions had been received from England on the subject of increasing the number of Vicariates, and that a letter was lying before the Holy Father for approbation urging in strong terms an immediate answer respecting the matter, and the form of election of Bishops in future. Further he informed me that if no definitive result should come from the synod, Propaganda would feel itself called upon to take the matter into its own hands, and proceed to the formation of a plan to be proposed to the Bishops for acceptance. As I am myself perfectly in the dark as to what has been done, I could make no reply further than to suggest that time should be given for a reply from Dr. Griffiths, to whom Mgr. Cadolini said he had written. If the delay has

[1] *Clifton Archives.*

arisen from the time required to draw up a full report, still some general intimation to Propaganda of the conclusion of the Conference seems to have been expected. I have felt it my duty therefore to communicate these feelings, so strongly expressed, to your Lordship that you may be guided by the knowledge of them to such decisions or course as in your wisdom you may think fit. The Pope is certainly deeply interested in the matter, having never failed to ask me every time I have had an audience when the Bishops would meet, or what decision they had come to. . . .

"With kindest wish to Drs. Brindle and Gentili, and any other acquaintance, I have the honour to be, my dear Lord,

"Your Lordship's obedient servant,

"N. WISEMAN."

Conspicuous among the accusers of the Vicars Apostolic was no less a man than the Earl of Shrewsbury, who visited Rome that year and remained a considerable time. He made no secret of his opinion that the English mission was in a deplorable condition, which he maintained was due to the incompetence of the Bishops, and the want of zeal among the Secular clergy. He boldly maintained that the only hope for the future was to give more power into the hands of the Jesuits and Regulars, who he said had more zeal, as well as more capability and a better training. He said that the Bishops were opposed to the Regulars, and thus prevented much good which would otherwise be done.[1]

Some explanation of the Earl of Shrewsbury's attitude can be found in the fact that he had lived abroad so much that he was not fully conversant with the state of the English mission beyond the neighbourhood of Alton Towers, where he had spent the greater part of the few years that he lived in England. Some of the other accusers of the Bishops, chiefly recent converts, were still less qualified to speak on the subject; yet they were unfortunately listened to in high quarters. The unostentatious matter-of-course piety of the old-fashioned Catholics never appealed to them, and mistaking their aloofness for a want of zeal for the spread of religion, they laid the blame

[1] See letters from Bishop Baines to the Earl of Shrewsbury, dated February 26 and March 21, 1839 (*Clifton Archives*), in which he combats these opinions.

on their ecclesiastical superiors, and as the only hope of improvement, turned their eyes towards the Jesuits and Regulars.

In addition to these, there was also another source of the same class of rumours, alluded to afterwards by Dr. Ullathorne :—[1]

"Certain foreign ecclesiastics" (he writes) "gaining their earliest experience of the English mission, were also writing off their first impressions of work done by the English Bishops and Clergy, of the inaccuracy of which they were only convinced at a later time, and when the mischief was done."

The "foreign ecclesiastics" here alluded to were the Fathers of Charity at Prior Park. In addition to Dr. Gentili and his two companions, six others—three priests and three lay brothers, all Italians—had gone there in 1837, the best known being the Rev. John Baptist Pagani. From their first arrival they had all spoken freely of the low standard—as it appeared to them—of the clergy in England, an opinion really due to their wholly failing to understand the national character of the English. Dr. Gentili had endeavoured—as we have seen—to introduce a new spirit into Prior Park, and his first efforts had been crowned with some success. Afterwards, however, he seems to have proceeded beyond the limits of prudence, and we next hear of Bishop Baines giving him a peremptory order not to introduce any new customs or devotions without his express permission. Nor did his troubles end here; for his personal influence and that of the Fathers was so great that several of the Secular members of the staff wished to join the Institute of Charity. This created a new state of affairs, for while Bishop Baines was glad to avail himself of the services of the Fathers, he had no intention of allowing them to absorb the College and its work. He gave leave indeed to all who wished to join; but he also took the drastic step of removing Dr. Gentili, and entrusting to his care some of the convents of the District. It was questionable indeed whether in this he was not exceeding his powers, and at first Abbate Rosmini seemed likely to raise the question. After some thought, however, he decided that as the Institute had not yet received its formal approbation, it would be wiser to acquiesce in Dr. Baines's decision. He therefore recalled Dr. Gentili to Rome,

[1] *Hierarchy*, p. 22.

requesting him before his departure to hand over his office of Superior in England to Rev. John Baptist Pagani. Dr. Gentili not only obeyed, but coming to Prior Park, he went through a regular ceremony. Having assembled the whole household, he read the decree of his own deposition, and falling on his knees, begged pardon publicly for all the faults he might have committed in the discharge of his office. The ceremony was intended to be—and in Dr. Gentili's own mind, no doubt was —an act of abject humility; and some of those who assisted at it were edified. There were at least some, however, to whose English common-sense ideas the act did not appeal, and who thought that it savoured somewhat of affectation. As they could not understand his warm Italian nature, so he in turn failed to understand their cold phlegmatic Catholicity; and he unfortunately did not fail to give vent to his views both by letter, and afterwards, when he reached Rome, by word of mouth.

The Regulars themselves fostered the idea that more of the government of the mission affairs ought to be entrusted to them. They were no doubt conscious of the longer and more complete training which they went through, and considered that they might be of greater service to the English mission than in fact they were. They complained that the Vicars Apostolic were always hostile to them, and did not give them proper scope for action. At one time they felt so strongly on the matter that the Jesuits asked the Benedictines to join them in an appeal to Rome against the Bishops.[1] One of the Regulars, Rev. T. J. Nicholson—an Irish Carmelite, afterwards Archbishop of Corfu—boldly maintained that the only remedy was that the Bishops should in future be always chosen from the Regular clergy. The influence of the Regulars in Rome at that time was undoubtedly strong; and the Pope himself being a Regular they produced a great impression.

There is, however, another side to the picture, which it is well to bear in mind. The bulk of the hard work and the poorest missions for the most part fell to the Seculars. This is commonly the case, as the Regulars naturally only undertake

[1] See letter in *Downside Archives*, J. 153. I have not found whether the appeal was actually drawn out and sent; but undoubtedly representations were made at Rome on the matter.

Dr. Gentili

what they can properly do, whereas the Seculars are, as it were, the residuary legatees of the Church's work. Whatever is left over falls on their shoulders. Hence it often happens that they have to do much of the drudgery which has no ostensible result, and the more showy work connected with the reception of converts and the like falls to the lot of the Regulars. The habits of prudence which the Seculars had to cultivate at that time among the roughest portion of the population were sometimes mistaken for want of zeal; and naturally those engaged in that class of work talk less about the reception of converts and the spread of religion than those engaged among the upper classes. Dr. Gentili himself, who had been foremost among their accusers, lived to learn his mistake. The following letter from Bishop Ullathorne to Dr. Newman, written many years later, after Dr. Gentili's death, is very instructive on this point:—[1]

"The late Dr. Gentili, a bosom friend of mine, and as you know a saintly man, began in England with a lofty ideal, which happily never diminished in his own ardent spirit; and for many years he concealed not his opinions on the English clergy and their 'low' views. He became intimately conversant with their missionary struggles and with the nature of the people, old Catholics and Converts and Catechumens with whom they have to deal. A few months before his death I had, to my great happiness, many and long conversations with him, prolonged day by day for six weeks. His view of the facts of our position and of the nature of our contest had become wonderfully changed in the course of his missions. We had conversed as intimately just before he had begun his missions; he had then for years been a country missioner on new ground; but that experience had not changed his first opinions. It was his wide experimental knowledge of the whole body of society in England which is brought in contact with Catholic teaching which changed his views. He had become much more moderate in his mode of instruction, though he lamented its necessity. He saw that many things in the clergy which he had formerly attributed to sluggishness were to be ascribed to prudence. This fact must be taken with its right limitations. He lamented the hasty conclusions which

[1] *Birmingham Archives* (Begbroke).

new converts . . . and some indiscreet young Catholics of old stocks had reported in Rome, and also the mischief which had thus been created and from which we all had for a time to suffer. The foreign missioners [1] he conceived had for a time fallen into the same mistake. He longed himself to go to Rome to give in person this corrected view of things as his more intimate experience had found the case to be."

The mutual friction between the two bodies of clergy both engaged in the same work led to very unfortunate results, as had been the case in previous centuries; and while some of the Regulars maintained, as stated above, that the only remedy was to have the Bishops chosen from their body, with equal vehemence the Seculars asserted their right to a Secular Bishop. This feeling was perhaps even stronger in the North than in the South. All the Secular clergy of Manchester were at one time thrown into a ferment by the simple rumour that they were to have a Bishop chosen from the Regular clergy. They met and drew up petitions and remonstrances and only desisted when they learnt that the rumour was devoid of foundation.

Dr. Wiseman on the whole sided with those who found fault with the state of the English mission. He had been much impressed on his visits to England with the apparent want of zeal and religious spirit among the Secular clergy, and probably for the same reason as Dr. Gentili was. For he was almost like a foreigner in England, having spent so many years in Rome and having formed his ideals there. It is, however, remarkable that Dr. Newsham, who had recently been appointed President of Ushaw, felt in much the same way, though he admits that his views were not shared by priests actually on the mission. In his letters to Dr. Wiseman he speaks strongly on the matter:—[2]

"I wish I could have half an hour's conversation with you to expose the deplorable wants of the country. You show by your letter that you discovered something of them while in England. I could tell you ten times more than you saw. . . . I will then say to you frankly that there is a very great want

[1] The allusion is presumably to Father Dominic and his companions: see Chapter XIV.

[2] See his letters preserved at the English College, Rome.

of a spirit of piety, faith, and religion in our clergy. It is useless to investigate the cause of this. I will say briefly that it has probably in good measure arisen from the great majority of the missionaries being young men, from the little control that has been exercised by the Bishops for many years over their young priests on the mission, and probably above all from the spirit of the times, which is incessantly infused into the mind of a young man by our abominable newspapers. In fact a greater pest, a more efficient weapon of the devil does not exist in the world than the English newspapers. Their pernicious effects on the minds of our young ecclesiastics has been observed and lamented by many others as well as myself."

Turning to the remedies available, Dr. Newsham proceeds :—

"Now this spirit cannot be attacked or put down in a direct manner; too violent an opposition would be raised by the attempt. It must be subdued and conquered by indirect means, by exciting a spirit of faith and religion; and for the establishing of this there is no other way than ecclesiastical retreats. If such be the spirit of the clergy, you easily see what the laity must be. In fact you have in what I have said the key of what excited your surprise and regret when in England."

The allusion to ecclesiastical retreats was concerned with a large and important scheme. Dr. Wiseman was longing to get to work in England, and offered to resign his post as Rector in Rome, if he might be allowed to return and devote himself to giving missions and retreats up and down the country. Dr. Newsham favoured his scheme.

"I most cordially approve of your returning to England," he writes; "I am persuaded that nothing more effectual than what you propose to employ yourself in—giving retreats to the clergy, directing missions in the great towns, addressing the public through the press—could be devised for raising the zeal of the clergy, stimulating the apathy of the laity, confounding our enemies, and thus forwarding in a powerful and efficient way the interests of religion."

And elsewhere he adds :—

"I know that the Bishop (Dr. Briggs) is most anxious to accomplish what you would undertake if in England, namely,

ecclesiastical retreats for the clergy and missions for the laity in the great towns. I have heard him repeatedly speak on these subjects for many years, and I am sure that he would make almost any sacrifice to accomplish them."

Looking at it from a different point of view, Dr. Newsham adds :—

"But you are much wanted here for another purpose also, to write in defence of religion. The fact is we have not a man fully qualified for this task. Our priests you know are hurried through their studies, and then placed on the mission where they have either no time or inclination for study. The consequence is an ignorance of church history, of antiquities, of the Fathers, of the original languages and even of the mode of disputation adopted by our opponents. To read the defence of religion that occasionally appears perfectly sickens me. We want a man to give a new tone to controversy, and you are that man. I am sure then you ought to return to England."

Finally he said :—

"I am persuaded the Bishop, were the thing proposed to him, would forward it with all his interest. If you will allow me to act, I will leave no stone unturned to accomplish an object so dear to me."

He raised, however, one practical point, which had escaped Dr. Wiseman in his enthusiasm.

"If you are in no fixed situation, whence will your means of support be drawn? What will you consider sufficient to form an adequate subsistence? Answer these two questions. There is no other difficulty in our way : I can manage all the rest. And lose no time ; the sooner the thing can be settled the better."

These words were written on August 10, 1838. Almost immediately afterwards events happened quickly, one after another, which caused Dr. Wiseman to abandon the scheme outlined above, as it seemed probable that he might soon be called upon to return to England in another capacity.

In the first place, the influence of the Regulars prevailed at Rome, and led to the issue of two important decrees in their favour, dated September 29, 1838.[1] The first of these con-

[1] The text of these decrees will be found in Appendix F.

cerned the Indulgences which could ordinarily be granted by the members of various religious orders, such as those connected with saying the Rosary, which were in the hands of the Dominicans, and other similar instances. In view of the unfortunate disputes which had existed in England in past times, Pope Benedict XIV. in his Bull *Apostolicum Ministerium* had suppressed all such Indulgences in England, and commuted them in favour of certain others, the administration of which was left in the hands of the Vicars Apostolic. This part of the Bull had been quoted as stated in the re-issue of the Observanda recently brought out by the Vicars Apostolic. It would appear, however, that the Pope—himself a Regular—was only very partially aware of the circumstances which had led in the past to the withdrawal in question. He too wished to develop a warmer style of devotion in England, and looked on the establishment of Confraternities and other such associations as powerful helps to this object. He therefore boldly re-instated the Regulars in their full powers. In virtue of this decree in future the missioners of the different religious orders would always have special privileges to offer to their congregations which the Seculars had not, and the control was taken out of the hands of the Vicars Apostolic. This the Bishops considered a public indignity to offer them ; but beyond that, the practical result was not very far reaching. The second decree, however, went much further, and authorised the Regulars to set up missionary chapels when and where they should think fit, without any mention of obtaining permission from the Bishops.

The Vicars Apostolic could not but feel hurt at this second decree. Dr. Baines describes it as "a severe reprimand to us, and an approval of the many open and anonymous attacks made upon us by pious laymen or reforming priests". Dr. Griffiths expressed himself still more definitely :—[1]

"It is my decided conviction," he wrote, "that the decree, if acted upon, will disturb the peace of the Catholics in England. For independently of the general weighty causes for requiring the consent of Bishops for the erection of churches, there are reasons peculiarly applicable to England. The erection of a church in England is equivalent to the erection

[1] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*).

of a parish. Hence if churches be built without the consent of the Bishop, flocks can be divided, and part taken from one church and transferred to another without his consent. Again, the clergy are supported, the expense of each church defrayed by subscriptions, etc., of the faithful; hence if the consent of the Bishop is not required for the erection of a new church, it may be erected near another, and deprive the original church and clergy of its means of support. There will consequently be dissensions between flocks and pastors. These and similar reasons were no doubt the additional causes for Benedict XIV.'s marked application of this general Canon Law to England."

Dr. Briggs and, at first, Dr. Walsh felt in the same manner, and to add to the indignity, the decree had been issued without any previous consultation with the Bishops, so that it appeared almost like a declaration of want of confidence in them.

The Bishops met the difficulty in a straightforward and dignified manner. Dr. Griffiths wrote to Propaganda begging that the decrees might be suspended for a short time, to allow the Vicars Apostolic to discuss their provisions, and he called a meeting of them, to be held at his house in November.

Before the time for the meeting came, another document of the highest importance was received from Rome, to which we must now give our attention. We allude to the *Statuta Proposita*, or proposed new rules for the English mission, designed to supplement the *Apostolicum Ministerium* of Benedict XIV.[1] They were drawn up in Rome, and were of a wider scope than the *Statuta Provisoria* of the Vicars Apostolic; and though the part which concerned the relations between the Bishops and Clergy, etc., may be said to have been based on this latter document, they were far from being identical. Moreover, in the form in which they were sent, each regulation was accompanied by questions as to details on which the opinions of the Vicars Apostolic were solicited.

In the first place, disregarding the advice of the Vicars Apostolic, it was proposed to raise the number of Vicariates at once from four to eight. In order to help towards the

[1] See Appendix E.

support of the new Bishops, and at the same time to tend towards improved relations with the Regulars, it was proposed that the new District of Wales should be handed over to the English Benedictines, and that the President-General of that body should become Vicar Apostolic. The old Northern District was to be divided into three, viz., Lancashire, Yorkshire, and a new Northern District consisting of the remaining counties. Considering the number of Catholics in the first two of these, there would clearly be no difficulty in their supporting a Bishop; it remained to ask the opinions of the Vicars Apostolic whether means of support would be forthcoming in the re-constituted Northern District after these counties had been taken away, and in the District which it was proposed to create in the Eastern counties.

The remainder of the *Statuta Proposita*, so far as they concerned the English mission, were founded on the *Statuta Provisoria*, which were amplified and defined.

After this, as much space again was given to the consideration of the British Colonies, the spiritual needs of which were at that time coming into prominence. There had been for twenty years past a Vicar Apostolic in the West Indies, and another in the Mauritius, the latter of whom had at first the Cape Colony as well as all the Australian islands under his jurisdiction. More recently—in 1834—a Vicar Apostolic had been appointed in Australia—Bishop Polding, O.S.B. All these missions were in great need of priests, and as yet they had no local source of supply. And although Lower Canada, with its French population, was well provided for, there was a great lack of priests and also of means in the rapidly increasing districts of Upper Canada. In 1838 the Rev. W. B. Ullathorne, O.S.B.—the future Bishop—had been practically the pioneer of the work at the Antipodes, had visited Rome, and his account of the state of the Australian mission was translated into Italian and much read. This served, therefore, to direct attention to the whole subject of the needs of the Catholics in the British Colonies.

In order to make permanent provision for these needs, three measures were proposed. One was that a Seminary or College should be established exclusively for those destined for Colonial missions, analogous to the well-known College of

All Hallows at Dublin. Another was that an ecclesiastic should reside in London whose sole duty should be to watch over their interests. In the third place it was suggested that in order to carry these measures into effect, a systematic scheme of collections should be organised throughout the country, modelled on that of the *Oeuvre pour la Propagation de la Foi*, which had been established since 1822, with its head-quarters at Lyons, and had spread from France into other countries. About this third measure some further details must be given.

Efforts had already been made to introduce the *Oeuvre*, as it was commonly called, into England. So early as the year 1825, in the lifetime of Dr. Poynter, a beginning had been made; but it did not at that time assume any great proportions. In the year 1838 it was taken up by several prominent laymen, of whom the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Clifford, Sir Edward Vavasour, Mr. Chisholm Anstey, Mr. Charles Weld, and Mr. Henry Bagshawe were the chief, the three last-named acting as secretaries. In September of that year Bishop Walsh accepted the Presidency of the new English branch. The other Vicars Apostolic, however, showed some hesitancy in encouraging the work, apparently considering that the wants of the home mission were so great that they ought to take precedence. They had already set on foot an annual collection "for the purpose of propagating the Catholic religion," and they thought that this was enough. Thus Dr. Griffiths wrote that "the Vicars Apostolic, the only persons fully informed of the wants of their respective Districts, have determined that they will sanction the collection for foreign missions only in conjunction with the collection for religion in England". It is possible that the fact of the *Oeuvre* being chiefly patronised by the Jesuits caused Dr. Griffiths to encourage it less than he would otherwise have done, especially as at that time the Fathers had no church or mission in London. He complained that the only priest on the council was Father Lythgoe, S.J., all the others being laymen. Whatever his motive, however, the fact is certain that he did not encourage the *Oeuvre* in London. At the same time he did not forbid it, and as the Bishop's permission was all that was required by the rules, it was able to continue its existence; but neither he nor his colleagues (except of course Dr. Walsh) ever smiled upon it.

On reading the *Statuta Proposita*, the Vicars Apostolic considered that their action was approved by Rome; for they understood the passage relating to the *Oeuvre* as a suggestion that they should organise another Society, on the same lines indeed as the *Oeuvre*, but independent of it. This was unfortunately a total misapprehension of the intention of the Holy See, which had in fact been to give the Bishops a hint which might help on the establishment of the *Oeuvre* itself. Hence there arose a fresh source of misunderstanding.

With all these matters awaiting their consideration, the Bishops met at the house of Dr. Griffiths in Golden Square on November 20, 1838, and following days. All the four Vicars Apostolic attended, and four others came as "theological advisers"—Rev. Henry Weedall, President of Oscott; Dr. Youens, ex-President of Ushaw; Rev. Edward Norris, Dr. Griffiths's Vicar General;[1] and Dr. Baldacconi of the Sardinian Chapel, Lincoln's Inn Fields. They had two important documents to discuss—the decrees about the Regulars and the *Statuta Proposita*.

The decree about the Regulars came up for consideration first. The "theologians" discussed them on November 21, and presented their report the following day, when the Bishops resolved unanimously that "the first, respecting Indulgences, was uncalled for, not adapted to the present state of religion in England, and would be the source of discord between the Regular and Secular clergy"; and that "the second was subversive of Episcopal jurisdiction, and would give rise to dissensions and scandals". They further considered that the decrees were "surreptitious," that is that they had been obtained without the knowledge of those who had a right to be consulted, and hence that they were not binding until they had had the opportunity of putting forward their views on the matter. They then proceeded to draw up a personal letter to the Pope himself, begging at least for the revocation of that which concerned the building of churches without leave of the Bishop of the place.

Proceeding to the *Statuta*, they answered all the questions in plain and straightforward fashion. They agreed to hand

[1] The Rev. Francis Tuite, V.G., died on March 15, 1838, and was succeeded in the office of Vicar General by Rev. Edward Norris of Soho.

over the new Welsh District to the Benedictines, and said that adequate funds could be raised in the new districts to support the Vicars Apostolic. The only change in the proposed arrangements for which they asked was that Hertfordshire, which had been allocated among the Eastern Counties, should be retained in the London District, as it contained St. Edmund's College; and that Nottinghamshire should remain part of the Central District.

The answers to the other questions were for the most part short—in some cases simply *affirmative* or *negative*, or short phrases of that kind. The long section on the Colonies was answered in very few words. The schemes proposed were manifestly impracticable, and based on a complete want of knowledge of the means and resources of English Catholics. The Bishops merely said that no sufficient means would be forthcoming in all the three kingdoms for carrying out anything of the nature proposed; but they added that they had consulted with the leading laymen and arranged to appoint a committee to collect money on a similar system to that employed for the *Oeuvre*, and as soon as they could ascertain how much was likely to be produced, they would write again. And in sending these answers to Cardinal Fransoni, they at the same time informed him of their letter to the Holy Father about the decrees alluded to.

The answers of the Vicars Apostolic were not well received in Rome. They seemed to confirm the statements made by their enemies of their want of respect to the Holy See and want of zeal for religion. Writing on January 7, 1839, Dr. Wiseman gave a strong account of the dissatisfaction at Propaganda. Mgr. Mai was no longer there, as he had been raised to the Cardinalate, and Dr. Wiseman's interview was with Mgr. Cadolini, the new secretary. He describes it as follows:—[1]

"I had a long conversation with Mgr. Cadolini on the 15th inst. and found him in a state of considerable irritation at the suppression of the Association which the Pope has so much at heart. He complains that to the Rescripts which were clearly in the Pope's name, and by his express orders, execution was not given, on the surmise that they were *not*

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

the Pope's own act; while an expression in the *Statuta Proposita* was interpreted as the Pope's decision against the Association, although his name was never mentioned in the document, nor was it anything more than queries proposed *consultive.* I have not seen any of the answers, and therefore can say nothing; in the meantime Propaganda hears a great deal from private sources, which unfortunately has made matters worse. The Council of Paris has written to Lord Clifford, and may write to the Pope; the letter to Lord Clifford had been laid before Propaganda."

It might have been answered to this that the Vicars Apostolic had *not* suppressed the *Oeuvre;* they had given the authorisation requisite for its existence in England, and had only refused to become "Patrons". This was however manifestly a refusal to encourage it, and probably any such explanation would not have materially modified the irritation of the Pope, who seemed to have lost confidence in the Vicars Apostolic. He appointed a Commission consisting of Cardinals Fransoni, Lambruschini, Giustiniani, and Mezzofanti to go into the matter of the proposed new division of Districts and to report to him generally on the state and needs of the English mission. Dr. Wiseman had an audience early in February, and the Pope did not conceal his feelings. This we learn from the following extract from a letter from Dr. Wiseman to Bishop Griffiths dated February 16, 1839:—[1]

"What his Holiness spoke of with tears in his eyes were the following matters:—

"(1) The two Rescripts, the manner in which they were resisted or opposed. The tone of the letter (which I have not seen) gave him great pain. He explained the cause of this as being the *Monita*, which seemed to quote his authority for the invalidity of the regular indulgences in England. He said they were hardly aware of that provision of Benedict XIV. intended for other times, while petitions were constantly coming in for confraternities of the Rosary and Sacred Heart. Hence they thought it right to lose no time in contradicting the impression likely to be made by the *Monita* that the Holy See at present opposed the introduction of these pious practices.

"(2) The issuing of *Monita* in the form of Synodal (Provin-

[1] *Ibid.*

cial) Decrees, under the joint authority of all the Vicars, without first [obtaining] permission of the Holy See, and then submitting the Decrees to it for approbation. This he remarked the American Bishops do every three years when they hold their synods. Benedict XIV. *De Synodo* quotes Thomassin and other French Divines to prove that no Provincial Synod can issue Decrees without the previous approbation of the Apostolic See. Each Bishop may separately issue injunctions for his own District, but conjointly such cannot be published as binding on all the Districts by common authority. Moreover, his Holiness complained that the first sight he had had of the *Monita* in the original was a fortnight before, in the *Journal Historique*, where in fact a note is appended to the *De Indulgentiis*, saying that probably that was abrogated by a Rescript of 29 September, and giving the very Rescript above alluded to.

"(3) That he never had any communication from the Vicars that could console him, as of the progress of religion, the state of the Districts, etc., but that he had to learn what he could from newspapers, etc., while all correspondence was of a disagreeable nature. He spoke much of the tone and manner of this and former letters. I cannot but think that more attention ought to have been paid (I speak of such letters as I have seen) to forms, especially such as are of usage, for where such forms are always employed, departure from them necessarily bears the appearance of want of respect. In the same way the Pope remarked that the answers to the *Statuta*, instead of being such as to give light to the Pope, or of a deliberate form, was in the dry authoritative form of a decision, *affirmative* and *negative*, which is the way definitive replies are given in Congregations. I attributed all this, of course, to inexperience of forms, without the slightest idea of disrespect.

"The Pope was perfectly calm, but deeply moved, and said he should answer the Bishops' letter *da Papa*, as a Pope ought."

Soon after the receipt of these letters, the Vicars Apostolic held their annual Low Week meeting. They came together at Prior Park on April 8, 1839, the meeting lasting a full week. They passed several Resolutions, of which three concern our present purpose. The first was in the following terms:—

"Resolved, that as our common answer to the *Statuta Proposita* appears from Dr. Wiseman's letters not to have satisfied Propaganda, each Bishop write separately to give more ample information."

And the seventh was as follows:—

"Resolved, that a special agent be sent to Rome to supply Propaganda with information connected with the present ecclesiastical state of England."

But perhaps the most significant Resolution was the fifth, which indicated their suspicion of Dr. Wiseman as the source of much of the misunderstanding which had arisen, and their wish to exclude him from their counsels in future. The following is the text of it:—

"Resolved, that the future agent of the Bishops at Rome be unconnected with the English College, and not employed in any other office."

The tone as well as the substance of this Resolution shows that the Bishops underrated the strength of Dr. Wiseman's position in Rome, and the confidence which was reposed in him by the authorities there. In point of fact, their opposition to him tended not to allay, but to increase the misunderstandings with which the situation had become surrounded.

We can conclude this chapter with a brief account of the sequel with respect to the *Oeuvre*, chiefly taken from a correspondence between Mr. Charles Weld and Lord Clifford,[1] the latter of whom was then in Rome. From these letters we gather that the Council met shortly after the Bishops' meeting, and Mr. Bagshawe informed them of the new Society to be formed by the Bishops, by desire, they said, of the Pope. Naturally therefore the members thought that it would be more loyal of them to break up the English branch of the *Oeuvre*, and they were actually preparing to carry this into effect, when Father Norris, the Provincial of the Jesuits, arrived back from a visit to Rome, and declared that the whole must be a misunderstanding, as the Pope was warmly anxious for the continuance and development of the *Oeuvre* in England. Mr. Weld accordingly wrote to Lord Clifford, who was then in Rome, asking him to ascertain whether the Holy See was in fact anxious to supplant the *Oeuvre* by a

[1] *Birmingham Archives* (Begbroke).

new association, and receiving an answer in the negative they determined to continue. Mr. Bagshawe accordingly wrote to Dr. Griffiths, asking him to patronise the *Oeuvre*.

After some consideration Dr. Griffiths decided to continue to authorise its existence in his District, this being necessary according to its own rules for its lawfulness, and for the validity of its Indulgences; but he refused to give it any positive encouragement. He wrote to Mr. Bagshawe as follows:—[1]

"35 Golden Square, 13 *February*, 1839.

"Dear Sir,

"Having already patronised and recommended through my respected Clergy to every member of my beloved flock a mode of contributing towards the Propagation of the Faith in Foreign Missions which in union with all the other Vicars Apostolic I judged most suitable to this missionary country, I cannot patronise for the same object another Society in the London District, however well adapted to Catholic countries.

"I remain, dear Sir,
"Your very faithful servant in Christ,
" + Thomas Griffiths."

A month later Dr. Walsh himself wrote to Dr. Griffiths, but with no better success. He received the following answer:—[2]

"35 Golden Square, *April* 23, 1839.

"My dear Lord,

"I shall be most happy to join your Lordship and the other Vicars Apostolic in giving my consent for the establishment of the *Oeuvre* in the London District, as well as your Lordship's and the other Districts of England. As our *consent* alone is required for the faithful to gain the Indulgences, it will be a sufficient approbation in the present state of England, and will not be in contradiction to the resolution we came to, and will be in agreement with foreign Bishops. . . .

"Believe me, my dear Lord,
"Yours most faithfully,
" + Thomas Griffiths."

[1] Griffiths Letter Book, *Westminster Archives*. [2] *Ibid.*

There was now left only one final resort, already appealed to, and the appeal proved successful. Early in May, 1839, Dr. Griffiths sent out a circular announcing that "in consequence of a communication from Rome," the *Oeuvre* was to be established and its collections made regularly throughout England. He added that as it was undesirable to have two collections for the same object, the missionary collections formerly ordered by the Bishops could in future be omitted. At the same time, the Indulgences, of which at length an authoritative list had been received, were promulgated. The *Oeuvre* was then reconstituted; Bishop Walsh retired from the Presidency, and joined with his brother Bishops in becoming "Patrons" of the Society, while a lay President was elected in the Earl of Shrewsbury.

CHAPTER X.

CREATION OF EIGHT VICARIATES.

AT the stage which we have now reached, a new figure comes on the scene, in the person of Mgr. (afterwards Cardinal) Acton, who had recently returned to Rome, after the funeral of his younger brother, Sir Ferdinand Acton, of Aldenham Hall, in Shropshire. His antecedents were of a very unusual type for a Roman ecclesiastic. His family had been Catholics for several generations. He was born in 1803 at Naples, where his father, Sir John Francis Acton, had been in the Government service, and had at one time held the post of Prime Minister. Soon after the birth of his younger son he succeeded to the family estates, and came to reside in England. He entrusted his two sons to the care of a French *émigré* priest; but Sir John Acton died in 1811, and the future Cardinal passed to the care of guardians, who, while willing to respect his religion, wished to prepare him and his brother for life like an ordinary English gentleman by a public school and university education. He therefore entered Westminster School; but very soon difficulties about his religion led to his withdrawal, and he went to live with a country clergyman to prepare for Cambridge. He entered Magdalene College in 1819, and went through the usual course, but was unable to take his degree, as in those days a necessary condition was to sign the Thirty-nine Articles. Immediately afterwards he declared his wish to devote himself to the ecclesiastical state, and repaired to Rome, where he studied at the well-known "Academia dei Nobili Ecclesiastici," where he was ordained priest. His talents no less than his social position soon marked him out for posts of importance, and he had already filled several high offices, when in January, 1837, he was nominated "Uditore della

Cardinal Acton

Camera"—a position which made his future Cardinalate certain.

After his visit to England on the occasion of the death of his brother, Mgr. Acton returned to Rome to take up the duties of his new post at the end of the year 1837. His sunny disposition and unfailing cheerfulness made him a general favourite with all who knew him. The Pope had a very high idea of his powers, and used to consult him about the affairs of England. Mgr. Acton soon became anxious to act as intermediary, and if possible to restore the good understanding between the Vicars Apostolic and the Holy See.

He began by giving his attention to the question of the decrees concerning the Regulars, about which the difficulty had arisen. On learning that the Pope had taken offence at the joint letter of the Vicars Apostolic, Dr. Griffiths had at once written apologising for any disrespect of language. Bishop Walsh went further, and said that on consideration, he saw nothing detrimental in the decrees. In reporting his action to Dr. Griffiths, he writes as follows:—[1]

"If you recollect, my dear Lord, you mentioned more than once whilst we were at Rome that the number of Catholics in and about London was equal to the whole population of the Eternal City. This and other accounts of the progress of Catholicity in England sent from time to time to Rome, and a degree of opposition to the Regulars in some parts of England, and the *Monita* gave rise to the two decrees of the 29th September, which I must candidly acknowledge on more serious consideration would have been at all events very harmless, had they been prudently managed by the Bishops. I had no fear of them in the Midland District, and should be very glad if the Regulars would build a church and undertake to evangelise some part of the increasing and populous town of Birmingham."

As a result of these two letters, Mgr. Acton wrote to Dr. Briggs that both Bishops had withdrawn their opposition. With respect to Dr. Griffiths, however, this was far from being the case. He was able to write a most humble apology for

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

errors of language, while at the same time his opinions on the question had not changed. His explanation to Mgr. Acton was most characteristic :—[1]

"The duty of manifesting in word and action devoted attachment and obedience to the Holy See is one of unmixed pleasure, and I trust to the enlightened mind and impartial discernment of his Holiness that the dutiful representation of evils resulting from any proposed measure will be regarded only as an additional proof of my devotion to him. I should ill discharge my office of Vicar Apostolic if I concealed my convictions of what was injurious to Religion from the fear of my words or motives being misconceived by the Holy See. I wish to combine the most profound respect with my earnest endeavours to preserve my flock from threatened divisions and dissension. It is in this spirit that I request you will, in charity to the Catholic religion in England, lay before the Holy Father the consequences of enforcing the decree of the 29th September."

Dr. Baines threw the blame on Dr. Wiseman and Bishop Walsh. In a letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury, dated February 26, 1839, he writes :—[2]

"The more I reflect on these decrees and the opinion which your Lordship and Lord Clifford entertain respecting them, the worse do I think (I grieve to say it) of the episcopal agent. He knows what these decrees imply ; I know in his own mind he is as hostile to them as any of us ; and that should he succeed in his plans, the day will come when he will prove a much more powerful opponent. He ought then to have stood forward in our defence, stated the great inconveniences that would result from the execution of these decrees, and counteracted the effort of those who have succeeded in misrepresenting all our proceedings and all our feelings towards our ecclesiastical superiors. Instead of doing this, he has fanned the flame which mistaken zeal has enkindled against us, and already caused a division in the episcopal body which will not easily be repaired, and in spite of our best endeavours to prevent it, will cause quite a scandal.

"It always happens that where the mind is weak, the disposition is obstinate. Hence I despair of ever convincing a

[1] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*). [2] *Clifton Archives.*

certain authority here [1] how wrong he is acting in allowing himself to be swayed by persons who give advice hostile to unity and peace. But I will not dwell on this painful subject. By a letter I received yesterday from Dr. Walsh it appears that he has been induced to retract every agreement he made with the Bishops at our last meeting, so that we shall once more have the Catholic body divided between the Midland on the one side, and all the other Bishops on the other, whilst Rome now takes part with the one against the three."

In the event, Mgr. Acton was commissioned to inform the Vicars Apostolic that they had misconceived the nature of the decree about the Regulars building churches; it was assumed that they would ask the leave of the Bishop, and likewise that they would not wish to build a new church near an existing one. Dr. Wiseman also forwarded a translation of a letter from Cardinal Fransoni to himself, dated March 13, 1839, to much the same effect: [2] "With regard to the new churches of Regulars, it is undeniable that the consent of the Ordinaries is requisite; but the Sacred Congregation, conformably to the common law, to avoid the evil effect of any less equitable refusal, such as has occasionally been given under the sanction of the above-named constitution of Benedict XIV., has thought itself bound to remove such obstacles and recall to mind that such a refusal can never be made without just grounds, reserving to itself the examination of such grounds, whenever any Vicar should think he cannot grant his consent to the erection or opening of any new church." A formal decision in this sense was addressed to the Vicars Apostolic under date September 5, 1839.[3]

This explanation satisfied the Vicars Apostolic, who considered it as practically explaining the decree away; for the Regulars had always been considered at liberty to build or accept a church with leave of the Bishop. The other decree, concerning Indulgences, they considered of minor importance, and as the Pope was unwilling to go back upon it, they accepted it without further demur.

In the meantime, Mgr. Acton had also been taking part in the negotiations with respect to the hoped-for restoration

[1] Apparently Bishop Walsh. [2] *Archives of English College, Rome.*
[3] See Appendix F.

of the hierarchy. He was himself opposed to the idea, and his opposition long proved effectual. He declared that "the English throughout their history had been factious, and opposed to authority, and were not to be entrusted with more and more independent power". He succeeded in influencing more than one of the important authorities to this effect, and they appealed to Lingard's *History* in confirmation of the statement. Mgr. Acton drew out his view of the case in a long document, which he presented to the Pope, and for the time he gained his way. As an alternative he proposed increasing the number of Vicars Apostolic and drawing up new regulations for the mission, suited to the altered circumstances. He had already conferred with Cardinal Fransoni—in fact, the *Statuta Proposita* had been drawn up in consultation with him. He was now anxious to induce the ecclesiastical authorities in England to accept them as the solution of the difficulties, at least for the time being.

It would appear that the Benedictines in England were aware of the course which events were taking, and thought the moment opportune for putting forward a claim, which represented a long cherished hope in their body, for a dominating share either in the new hierarchy, or in the new Vicariates, as they had formerly had in the hierarchy of Catholic England. They drew up a petition in this sense, which will be found in full in the Appendix.[1] They urged that in former times there had been at least seven Benedictine sees, one of them Canterbury itself, and the Benedictines had had various rights in connection with several others. Moreover, since those days they had kept up a continuous succession of titular Cathedral Priors of the ancient Monasteries concerned with a view to resuming their position, should circumstances ever render it possible; and it was the actual holders of these titles who signed the document.

It did not lead, however, to any tangible result. It had already been arranged to offer the Benedictines one of the new Districts, and although it was at one time proposed to hand over to them one of the more important dioceses, for various reasons it was thought advisable not to do so at that time.

[1] See Appendix E.

In the meantime, in order to forward his views as to the *Statuta*, Mgr. Acton had a copy of them sent to certain of the leading ecclesiastics in England, amongst others to the Jesuit "agent" who lived in London, who in turn sent copies to various members of the Society in different parts of England. Mgr. Acton also wrote to Dr. Lingard, but he found him in favour of a regular hierarchy.[1] By this time so many priests were in the secret that Dr. Briggs came to the conclusion that it would be better if they all knew it, so as to prevent the whispering and gossip which resulted from its supposed secrecy. He therefore had the *Statuta* printed, and sent a copy to each of his priests. They did not receive them favourably, and it was probably owing to this that fresh petitions were sent to Rome for the restoration of the hierarchy; amongst others by the Midland clergy, at their annual meeting at Sedgley Park.

This practically sealed the fate of the *Statuta Proposita;* nothing more was ever heard of them, but the same end was aimed at through other means. On September 28, 1839, Cardinal Fransoni wrote a short letter to Dr. Griffiths informing him that while the erection of diocesan sees must be postponed for the present, the number of Vicariates would be raised from four to eight without delay. No new regulations were proposed, beyond the suggestion that in order to prepare the way for the restoration of the hierarchy at some future time, each Vicar Apostolic should choose an informal Chapter who should act as his advisers, without, however, possessing any canonical status. In the latter part of the same letter, he gave a somewhat abrupt injunction that if the Vicars Apostolic met from time to time, they must be careful not to promulgate in any corporate capacity their decrees or resolutions, without first referring them to the Holy See.

On January 18, 1840, the Cardinal wrote asking the Bishops to suggest names of likely candidates for the new Districts. Such a request evidently required a little time for consideration. Dr. Griffiths answered on January 18—about ten days after the receipt of the letter—but apparently this was not quick enough. Ordinarily Rome moves slowly, but in the present instance they seem to have suspected the

[1] *Life of Lingard*, p. 264.

Vicars Apostolic of intentional procrastination, and Cardinal Fransoni proceeded, in conjunction with Mgr. Acton, to draw out a list of those considered to be "episcopabiles," and sent it to each of the Vicars Apostolic for their remarks. The list numbered fifteen. As many of them belonged to other Districts, Dr. Griffiths wrote round to the various Bishops, and on receipt of their answers, sent in his reply on February 15, 1840. It is noticeable that he assured Cardinal Fransoni that if Dr. Weedall, the President of Oscott, was nominated, he would certainly refuse to accept the honour—which in fact came about just as he had said.

The arrangements for the division of Districts and the consequent appointment of new Bishops were completed during the first half of the year 1840. During their progress considerable unrest began to show itself among the clergy in the London District, who were not informed of how matters were proceeding. Their grievances were emphasised by the fact that the Northern clergy, having received copies of the *Statuta Proposita*, knew of the impending division of Districts, and the London clergy had been left to learn it from them. At the annual meeting of the "Secular Clergy Common Fund" —known then, as now, as the Great M,[1]—the matter was discussed with some bitterness, and a petition to the Pope was drawn up, complaining of the manner in which they had been treated. A few extracts from this petition will give the best indication of its scope and tone:—

"While others"—the petitioners write[2]—"have been admitted to the knowledge of those things which were being done concerning us, we alone were left in ignorance of all things which nevertheless chiefly concerned us. So much so that whilst even laymen themselves were encouraged to express their wishes and to mix themselves up with ecclesiastical affairs, we alone, to whose care as pastors and priests these men have been committed by thee—we alone were strangers to things which regard us in the first place and touch us most

[1] Probably from the M in the *Ordo* which notified the day and hour of their meeting.

[2] The petition was of course in Latin, and was printed. A translation was also afterwards printed, with notes in reply to the arguments. The quotations given here are from the printed translation.

nearly. Never has it been asked what we may chance to wish, never has our opinion been requested. We are sent away to toil and obedience; and it very seldom happens that we arrive at a knowledge of the things that pertain to the government of us until they become known by a ratified statute, by irrevocable law.

"You see, most Holy Father, what causes have hitherto held us as it were dumb. Nor should we even now burst forth into words, but that we have learnt from our brethren in another District, whom a little better lot has favoured, that it is under deliberation to increase the number of our Prelates, and divide the mission afresh. Verily with grief we have learnt this; not because the number is to be increased, but because, as it is said, the vicarial state is to be retained: because it is now decreed that some of the Regular clergy are to be admitted into the episcopacy; because, lastly, it is not decreed to restore that Hierarchy which has preserved our holy Faith in Ireland, and which in proportion as anyone is intelligent and clear-sighted among our countrymen, is so much desired as the most certain way of propagating our faith. Verily if an opportunity were given us of standing at the feet of your Holiness, and of accosting thee in words, we should pour forth suppliant prayers from the fulness of our hearts in the cause of the Church of our Fathers; we should call on thee, showing those former and continual honours of the Church founded by Gregory the Great and Augustine, truly pointing out present inconveniences and wants; we should beseech thee to receive our prayers with open ears, and to recall this Church, by a return to its former state, into that seat which it held for so many ages among the Churches of the Christian world. But even from afar off, through such great intervals of space, from this vineyard for which we toil unto sweat, and which attests our faith, we send forth our voices; do not disregard us, we implore; reject not the prayers of thy sons; benignantly incline thy paternal mind to us; we call upon that most loving mind, which was ever remarkable in the Chief Bishop, that our wish may be speedily fulfilled."

In the latter part of the petition they return to the old subject of Seculars versus Regulars:—

"We pray that by whatever jurisdiction, whether vicarial or ordinary, the Bishops shall at last govern, whether increase be made in the number of Vicars or things remain as now, in the meantime, until that restoration which we hope for be effected, all who may be chosen for the Episcopacy may be from the Secular clergy; because far, very far, a greater number of those over whom the Bishops are to preside are Seculars than Regulars. To make this evident, let this London District be an example, in which the Seculars who serve the missions are ninety-four, the Regulars only five, or at most six. And yet although the Seculars prevail over the Regulars so much in number, on the other hand some of these (Regulars) weigh us down, and weigh us down in such a manner that we sustain detriment such as your Holiness could scarcely suspect. . . . Even at Rome, if we have heard the truth, [their] supporters vaunt of the zeal of these men, of their labours, of the marvellous usefulness which they bring to the commonweal; but us they accuse of sluggishness. But to say what is true, we are poor not by vow but in fact. Almost all of us have been ordained on no title of patrimony, but only on that of the mission."

And they conclude as follows:—

"We have not said these things as being the accusers of our brethren, as envying those who, being more fortunate than we, labour with us in the vineyard. To attest the truth, to refute accusations made against us, this alone we pretend, this we purpose. That your Holiness may plainly see in what state things are with us, that we wish and desire, in order that so it may embrace benignantly our prayers and place over us those Bishops who being chosen from among us, and in some way postulated by us, may be expected to attend to what will most conduce to the interests and progress of the Catholic religion, and also to our advantage and protection."

Apparently there was some bitterness of feeling and the clergy were by no means unanimous on the propriety of the petition. When it came to the question of signing it, only fifty-nine appended their names—not much more than half of the total number of the clergy of the District. There was, however, another matter about which they felt aggrieved, in

which they were more united, not only in London, but also in the North. They apparently shared the Bishops' resentment at the position which Dr. Wiseman was taking up in Rome with respect to the English mission, considering that he was endeavouring to force schemes of his own which were not always acceptable to them; and that the Bishops, as well as they themselves, having had long experience of the English mission, were far better able to judge of its deeds than a priest under forty years of age, who had lived most of his life in Rome.

An instance in point had occurred lately. Dr. Wiseman had long had in his mind a scheme for inducing a religious community to come to England, who should not undertake any parochial duties, but should hold themselves free to give missions and retreats in different parts of the country, in a manner common enough in Italy and other countries, but hitherto unknown in England. He had great hopes that such a work would be very fruitful of conversions to the Catholic Faith. The congregation which he naturally thought of in this connection was that of the Passionists. Blessed Paul of the Cross,[1] their founder, had always had a devotion to the conversion of this country, and had seen in vision England restored to her place in Catholic unity. In like manner one of the best known of the Passionists of that day, Father Dominic of the Mother of God, had a similar devotion, and a life-long yearning to go and work in England. He also declared his confidence that his prayer would be heard, and that he would one day set foot in Britain to work for religion there. Dr. Wiseman had often spoken to him of the chance of this coming about, and various proposals for that end had been made during the past two years, but for one reason or another they had all proved abortive.[2]

Now, however, a fresh effort was made, in consequence of the generosity of Mr. Lisle Phillipps, who offered a suitable house near Leicester for the new community, together with a small endowment. Father Spencer wrote to Mgr. Acton begging him to take the matter up. This time the arrange-

[1] Since that time, the founder of the Passionists has been canonised, and he is now properly spoken of as *Saint* Paul of the Cross.

[2] Cf. Dr. Wiseman's own account in his *Life*, ii., p. 121.

ments seemed about to be successful. Mgr. Acton communicated with Propaganda, and having secured the approval of that Congregation, he put the scheme before the general Chapter of the Passionists which was held in Rome in April, 1839. They agreed to undertake the mission, though petitioning for a few months' delay to arrange details. The fathers were actually chosen, and it is worthy of remark that Father Dominic was not one of them, for he was at that time elected Provincial of another Province.

Apparently Dr. Wiseman had his doubts as to how far the Vicars Apostolic would welcome the new missionaries, and in order to guard against any possible hitch, it was determined to postpone the matter until after his visit to England in the summer of that year. He did not reach Rome on his return journey until December. We have unfortunately no definite account of what happened with respect to the Passionists, but it would appear that Dr. Wiseman's fears proved well founded. The general feeling was that foreign missioners would not understand English ways, even if they were able to learn the language, and that their importation into England was not likely to lead to good results.[1] At any rate, for whatever reason, the scheme was for the time abandoned.

Dr. Wiseman, however, did not lose sight of the main idea, and a month or two later we find him making a formal petition to the Pope that he would send over a band of missionaries belonging to some religious congregation. The Pope, however, naturally worked through the ordinary channels, and commissioned Propaganda to communicate with the Vicars Apostolic and ask their opinions on what was proposed. At the same time Dr. Wiseman himself wrote to Dr. Griffiths to inform him of what he had done.

The scheme was not well received by the English Vicars Apostolic, for the simple reason that it appeared as though Dr. Wiseman was invading their domain. Dr. Griffiths wrote to him on February 28, 1840, in the following terms:—

"I have expressed to you my cordial approbation of a body of movable missioners, whose lectures, retreats, etc., may powerfully contribute to sanctify Catholics and increase their numbers in England; but yet I must express my regret that

[1] See *Life of Ambrose de Lisle*, i., p. 105; *Life of Father Dominic*, p. 110.

an application should have been made on these subjects to His Holiness without the expressed sanction of the Vicars Apostolic of England. . . . The missionary body had not received our united approbation. I must confess that I had no idea of an application being made to His Holiness on the subject, considering it as easy of arrangement by those Bishops who approved of it. I hope no further step will be taken till the question has been duly considered by us collectively. I intend to propose it at the next meeting. I fear, however, that our increasing wants will necessarily confine our missioners to particular chapels. We are like parents struggling to provide necessary food for our rapidly multiplying children, and compelled to neglect superfluities."[1]

In commenting to the other Vicars Apostolic on Dr. Wiseman's action, Bishop Griffiths asks:[2] "Should our recognised Agent act in this manner without consulting us? Is there not danger of confusion in our government from these unauthorised applications? Does not this show the danger of persons whose prudence is not guided by experience having authority in this country?"

The clergy resented Dr. Wiseman's interference as much as the Bishops did, and at the meeting alluded to, they passed a resolution similar to that passed by the Bishops themselves at Prior Park: "That the Vicars Apostolic be requested to allow an agent in Rome independent of the English College there," adding at the same time an offer to subscribe among themselves a sufficient sum for his support. And in order to show solidarity among the Secular clergy, they arranged for a similar resolution to be passed on the same day by a meeting of the Northern clergy at York. At both places the resolution was carried unanimously.

Both the petition and the resolution were abortive, for before they reached Rome the arrangements for the new vicariates had already been decided upon; and the one predominant feature of these was that Dr. Wiseman was to come to England. It would evidently have been useless to appoint him Coadjutor to Bishop Griffiths, for these two were quite out of sympathy with one another. Moreover, the Midland District was at that time in some respects more important even than London,

[1] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*). [2] *Ibid.*

not only because of the active development of Catholic work due to the zeal and generosity of the Earl of Shrewsbury, but also because Oxford was situated therein. At this time the movement connected with that University was at its height, and sanguine persons among the Catholic body were looking for many conversions as the probable result. It was known that Dr. Wiseman shared these hopes, while at the same time, should these be realised, it was recognised that he was the only man who possessed the breadth of mind and largeness of sympathy to deal successfully with the new converts. He was accordingly appointed Coadjutor to Dr. Walsh, who became Vicar Apostolic of the new "Central District," formed out of the old Midland District after North Wales and East Anglia had been cut off. Moreover, in order to give him a position and a base of action, he was likewise appointed President of Oscott. This involved displacing the existing superiors there, which was effected by raising both President and Vice-President to the episcopate—Dr. Weedall as Vicar Apostolic of the new Northern District, comprising Northumberland, Cumberland, and Durham; and Rev. William Wareing that of the Eastern District. Moreover, as it was known that Dr. Weedall would probably seek to decline his promotion, Mgr. Acton wrote a special letter to Dr. Walsh to press upon him the necessity of insisting on his acceptance.

The other arrangements came naturally. Dr. Griffiths retained the London District, which was less changed than any of the others—only losing the counties of Bedfordshire and Buckinghamshire. Dr. Baines in like manner retained the residue of the Western District, after handing over the Principality of Wales to the Benedictines; and of this new District the Prior of Downside, Rev. T. Joseph Brown, became the Bishop. Dr. Briggs, living as he did at York, naturally took that division of the old Northern District, while the Lancashire division was handed to Dr. George Brown, to whom Dr. Sharples was soon afterwards appointed Coadjutor.

Although the appointments were all ratified early in May, the briefs for the new Vicars Apostolic were not made out and signed until July 3, 1840. The formal notices to the Vicars Apostolic bore date July 11, 1840. Dr. Wiseman, being a

Coadjutor, received his briefs somewhat earlier, and he was consecrated as Bishop of Melipotamus[1] by Cardinal Fransoni himself at the English College on Whit Monday, June 8, 1840.

[1] It is perhaps worthy of remark that three days before Dr. Wiseman's consecration, one of his predecessors in the titular see of Melipotamus, Mgr. Delgado, was declared Venerable, with leave to proceed at once with the process to lead to his beatification.

CHAPTER XI.

APOLOGIA FOR THE VICARS APOSTOLIC.

In the foregoing pages we have been brought across the unfortunate misunderstandings between the Holy See and the Vicars Apostolic. This was in part at least due to the failure of the Roman authorities to understand the actual state of affairs in England. Throughout they formed a very exaggerated notion of the prospects of English Catholicity, and this easily led to the idea that the Bishops might be going forward more quickly than was in fact the case.

Nevertheless, it should in all fairness be admitted that the misunderstanding was in part due to the Vicars Apostolic themselves, in not taking the trouble to ascertain the usual mode of procedure in their dealings with the Holy See. The Roman Curia is to this day surrounded by more formality than is commonly observed in England: this was much more so in days when the Pope was a temporal Sovereign and the Cardinals kept up their full position as Princes of the Church. Any man of the world, in applying to such a court, would take the pains to put himself in good odour at the outset by acquainting himself with the proper formalities he is expected to go through. This, however, the Vicars Apostolic sometimes failed to do. Thus for a long time they did all their business by messages through their Roman agent—at that time Dr. Wiseman—and only rarely wrote to Propaganda themselves. When in 1837 they received a definite request to communicate in future direct, they did not take the trouble to ascertain the kind of paper and mode of address expected. Dr. Griffiths wrote with a carbon copier, so that the letters received had the appearance of being written in pencil. Not infrequently, when no definite answer seemed called for, the receipt of the

letter was not even acknowledged. As Dr. Wiseman justly remarked, a failure to take this trouble is naturally construed as a want of practical respect. In the case of Dr. Griffiths, who was ordinarily such a precise man, we can only attribute it to his lack of experience.

But in truth more was wanted. It was a time when the growing facilities of travel were putting Rome within reach of London in a way which had never before been the case, and the authorities were in fact longing for a closer intercourse than had obtained in the past. In these circumstances the English Bishops stood in need of a leader, who would make his influence felt, by visiting Rome, and by frequent correspondence with the authorities there. Such a leader they did not possess. The only one among their number qualified to exercise such a position was Dr. Baines, and he was so much occupied in fighting his own battles that he had no leisure to act on behalf of his colleagues. Indeed in view of the many personal difficulties which he had with the Roman court, his acting as representative of the Vicars Apostolic would have done them harm rather than good. Practically Dr. Griffiths took the lead. Already in Dr. Poynter's time the London Vicar, living as he did at the seat of government, was gradually assuming a position like that of an Archbishop, and the years that had since passed away had intensified this state of affairs. Yet it is no disrespect to Dr. Griffiths to say that he was not a successful leader. He had been chosen for his office not for any qualifications of that nature, but for his administrative capabilities and his power of sustained work. Dr. Ullathorne calls him "a holy and industrious Prelate, most sedulous in his charge, and enjoying the confidence of his clergy". This was the type of man that was needed for the wants of the metropolis. The London District was becoming a large diocese, and needed continuous hard and methodical work. This Dr. Griffiths could give. Indeed there has rarely lived a Bishop who administered his diocese more thoroughly and conscientiously than he did. His whole heart and soul were thrown into his work, and the sense of the weight of his responsibility was always before him. He walked indeed on well-trodden lines and had no ambition to depart from them; but in his own unobtrusive way he left his mark on the organisation

of the diocese. He improved the arrangements for the clergy retreat, so that each priest might have the opportunity of joining it every year; for he had two in successive weeks, so that half the priests could attend the first and the other half the second. He also organised regular theological "Conferences," which they had to attend at fixed intervals at various centres in the District. He likewise instituted for the first time some kind of ecclesiastical dress for the clergy. This consisted merely of a Roman collar, to be used with a black coat, the shape and length of which was not prescribed, but presumed to be of the somewhat long shape then coming into vogue. And in conjunction with this, those who took to the new dress exchanged their knee-breeches for trousers—a step which was considered by some almost to savour of affectation. Indeed, the older clergy did not take kindly to the new dress, and as there was no means of enforcing its adoption, many of them did not conform. Indeed there were priests of the old school who dressed as laymen to within living memory. It is needless to add that the tonsure was never worn, not even by Regulars.

Dr. Griffiths also established, or approved of the establishment of, many guilds and confraternities, one being in connection with the well-known pilgrimage church in Paris, *Notre Dame des Victoires*, where special prayers were being offered for the conversion of England. In 1844 the Society of St. Vincent de Paul was introduced into his District, the prime movers being Frederick Lucas, William Amherst—afterwards the well-known Jesuit—and Charles Pagliano, a prominent London Catholic.

More than twenty years afterwards, when Manning was beginning his episcopate, Father Herbert Vaughan (as he then was) wrote to him,[1] "England wants to see an Archbishop whose house and way of life is such as we read of in St. Charles and in the B. Bartholomeo de Martyribus". He could have found what he wished in the house of Dr. Griffiths, whose life was as poor and simple as that of almost any Bishop in the history of the Church.

In a letter to his old pupil, Dr. Baggs, then Vice-Rector of the English College in Rome, Dr. Griffiths writes in this

[1] *Life of Cardinal Vaughan*, i., p. 149.

sense:[1] "Do they know the life which the Vicar Apostolic of London leads?" he writes. "He derives no temporal advantage from his chapels, clergy, or any of his duties. His whole time is occupied with his clergy or people. He is devising and executing plans for the education of his clergy, the building of chapels, the erection of schools, the instruction and clothing of the poor. If he seeks any other object than the sanctification and salvation of the flock, he is miserable and foolish as well as wicked."

The well-known clergyman, Rev. W. H. Brookfield, contrasts the poverty of Dr. Griffiths with the condition of an Anglican Bishop. "I just now saw the R.C. Bishop of London," he writes,[2] "get out of an omnibus in Piccadilly, seize his carpet bag, and trudge straight home with it to Golden Square. He had a blue cloak, but it hung below the skirts, and on he went. A very pleasing, venerable, episcopal-looking man, very like any other Bishop, save that none of ours would touch a carpet bag with his little finger."

Yet in the letters which he received from Propaganda there was a continual air of suspicion that he was not doing his duty. The Roman authorities seem to have been persuaded that the Bishops were slow to admit the true state of the country. They would believe any optimistic estimate from zealous converts or others visiting Rome, and put these before the Bishops, asking for an explanation. The following letter of Dr. Griffiths, dated December 11, 1842, to Dr. Baggs —who had by that time succeeded Wiseman as Rector of the English College, and formal agent of the Bishops—will serve to illustrate the state of affairs:—[3]

"You can inform his Eminence Cardinal Fransoni that the accounts he has received agree with my own statements, that there is great want of more and larger chapels or churches in London, and that much more good might be done if we had a greater body of clergy. But after stating these facts to his Eminence, let him understand distinctly, 1st, that the providing of churches and pastors requires much money; 2ndly, that the Catholic body, although contributing liber-

[1] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*).
[2] *Mrs. Brookfield and her Circle*, p. 279.
[3] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*).

ally according to their means, cannot on account of their general poverty do all at once; 3rdly, that the most destitute parts must first be attended to.

"1st. Much money is required for building churches—tell him that the purchase of six new sites for churches on which we purpose to build as soon as sufficient moneys are collected, have cost £4,500; that I have paid myself, independent of local subscriptions, £16,000 towards the building of other churches during the last five years; that in many numerous congregations the present priests could not be supported unless Providence inclined the hearts of others to give the Vicar Apostolic the means of assisting.

"2ndly. The Catholics being generally poor, cannot do all at once. They have to support their churches, to support their pastors, their schools, their charitable institutions; every want of Religion has to be supplied by their contributions. Let his Eminence understand that of the Catholics of London three-fourths are the poorest and least religious of the Catholics of Ireland, who emigrate continually to the large towns in England. The surprise is not that much room is wanted for the poor, but that so much has been provided.

"3dly. The most destitute parts of London are Virginia Street, Poplar, Deptford, Saffron Hill, Hackney. At Saffron Hill there are about 4,000 Catholics, and only a temporary Chapel made out of two rooms. At Hackney about 1,500 Catholics, and a temporary Chapel made of a schoolroom. At Deptford about 3,500 Catholics, and the same. At Virginia Street a congregation of 21,000, and a Chapel containing only 1,200. At Poplar a congregation of 5,000, and a Chapel not holding 800."

Perhaps the best way to meet these charges will be by a general account of the aims and ideals of the Vicars Apostolic and the work they actually accomplished—a kind of apologia for them, in short.

The Colleges.

We can begin our apologia by an account of that which is the most important feature in the work of a Bishop, and yet one of which the results are hardly visible until the time of

his successor. We allude to work for the education of the clergy. In this matter the Bishops acted in close concert with one another. During the period which followed the death of Bishop Bramston in 1836, three of the four Vicars Apostolic were ex-Presidents of Ecclesiastical Colleges—Dr. Briggs of Ushaw, Dr. Walsh of Oscott, and Dr. Griffiths of St. Edmund's—so that they were not likely to underrate the value of the work for which those institutions primarily existed. In 1838 they issued a joint Pastoral in which they recommended the work to the care of the faithful, at the same time giving expression to their hopes and aspirations for the future.

"Consider how rapidly our holy religion is again spreading its branches over this kingdom," they wrote; "what numbers have recently returned to the bosom of the Catholic Church; how many new missions have been established and how many of the old-established congregations have so far increased as to require an additional supply of labourers; and above all, how many large bodies of Catholics, especially in the Western District, are left without a pastor, being too poor to maintain one, and too distant to be visited by any other missionary. Hence not only are their children left without instruction, but no priest is found to administer to them the sacrament of Baptism, nor to impart to the dying the last consolations of religion. . . . Whilst therefore we rejoice to see the country whitening with an abundant harvest, it grieves us to the heart to find that our labourers are so few.

"Again, dearly beloved brethren, relieved as we now are from the oppression of the penal code, and placed on a level with the rest of our fellow-subjects, it becomes us to attend to this striking change in our position and to the new relations in which we now stand to the rest of our fellow-countrymen. Many of the Catholic community have rapidly risen to wealth and influence. While this happy change excites jealousy and provokes calumny on one hand, it enables the Catholic body on the other to assume the bold attitude of defence. It has afforded us great satisfaction to observe that a spirit of well-regulated zeal for the vindication of truth and the protection of the oppressed has of late strikingly manifested itself amongst us; nor can we doubt that all who see the necessity of defend-

ing their religion against the organised assaults of well-educated and powerful traducers, will also see the necessity of training up in our seminaries a strong body of learned men who whether they enter the sacred ministry or follow secular pursuits, may by their superior education be duly qualified to become the champions of truth. The course of studies pursued by those who are preparing for missionary duties ought certainly, under present circumstances, to be comprehensive. . . . Professors eminent for their talents and erudition, extensive libraries, conveniences for the cultivation of various branches of literature and science, with the necessary means of facilitating the progress and exciting the zealous emulation of our students, are loudly called for by the state of the times in which we live. We are therefore most anxious to afford to the ecclesiastical and secular youths educated in our episcopal seminaries all these great and essential advantages."

All the three older Colleges at this time were in a flourishing state, with plenty of signs of vigour and development. At Ushaw the long epoch-making Presidency of Dr. Newsham was just beginning, destined to produce a lasting effect on the future of the College. At Oscott Dr. Weedall was presiding, and his name too has become a household word in the College over which he ruled. St. Edmund's had, indeed, since the departure of Dr. Griffiths, gone through a period of unsettlement; but in 1840 Rev. Edward Cox entered on his eleven years of Presidency; he was a learned man, and a good German scholar —the translator of Döllinger's *Church History*—and had been one of Dr. Wiseman's students in Rome. At each of the three Colleges large additions were being made. At Oscott, as we have seen, the whole College was rebuilt between 1835 and 1838, the concluding stages being supervised by Pugin; and both at Ushaw and St. Edmund's, within the next few years, that architect was to build excellent specimens of a Collegiate church.

The Vicar Apostolic of the Western District, Dr. Baines, had likewise been closely connected with scholastic affairs at Ampleforth, and his work in the foundation of Prior Park has already been alluded to. The Vicars Apostolic of that day had united in ordering a joint collection throughout England on its behalf; now, after the disastrous fire of 1836, they re-

peated the act. Dr. Baines succeeded in rebuilding the part which had been destroyed, and for a time the College flourished. Ideas of a future Catholic University and centre of education seemed within measurable distance of being realised, and it was boldly suggested that one or more of the other Catholic Colleges should be closed and its students sent to swell the numbers at Prior Park. The following letter from Dr. Griffiths to the Earl of Shrewsbury refers to one of such schemes :—[1]

"GOLDEN SQUARE, 10 *October*, 1838.

"MY DEAR LORD,

"I received your Lordship's communication of the 22 September from Boulogne with the same kind feeling which dictated it, but cannot conceal my deep regret that your Lordship should have written to Drs. Walsh and Baines on the subject of breaking up my episcopal Seminary. I shall be scarcely able to convince them that your Lordship's letter was written without a knowledge of the present condition of Old Hall, which by the bounty of Divine Providence is prosperous in its Professors, in its pecuniary matters, and in its usual number of students, who have been divided into the classes of lay and ecclesiastic for more than twenty years—a division which your Lordship so highly approves. Even a struggling and experimental College could not be sacrificed by its Bishop without serious consultation with his clergy ; but the destruction of his episcopal Seminary of forty years' existence which has learnedly and virtuously educated most of his clergy without any injury whatever to his missions, would be condemned as severely by his clergy and people as by himself. If Oscott or Prior Park are in danger by their overbuilding or exertions, of which I have no knowledge, that is surely no reason for dissolving Old Hall, which is secure. Your Lordship will, I am confident, duly appreciate my feelings and solicitude for the fountain head of the London mission.

"Believe me with much respect and kindest regards,

"My dear Lord,

"Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

"+ THOMAS GRIFFITHS."

[1] Griffiths Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*).

In commenting to Dr. Baines on this letter, Dr. Griffiths wrote:—[1]

"My feelings on receiving Lord Shrewsbury's communication respecting the destruction of my Seminary are the same as your Lordship's would be should he propose to destroy your episcopal Seminary. Lord Shrewsbury has no knowledge of Old Hall, and by his imprudent letter gives rise to injurious reports and surmises. Old Hall is well supplied with Professors—its students are of the same number as usual—its finances are in good order, it is the fountain head of the London mission. There is no idea of any change whatever at Old Hall, because there is no reason for it."

Again a month later he wrote:—[2]

"With regard to Lord Shrewsbury's communication, with the best intentions, but without a knowledge of the present state of Old Hall, I was naturally solicitous, finding that your Lordship drew the necessary conclusion, that such a communication would never have been made without strong grounds. I can account for it only on the supposition that Lord Shrewsbury has been listening to some slanders which have not yet reached my ears."

Fresh troubles, however, were in store for Prior Park. In 1838, Dr. Logan, the Cambridge convert, left, and shortly afterwards we find him at Oscott, where he was destined one day to be President. A little later came the departure of Dr. Gentili, to which allusion has been made in a former chapter; and it turned out to be the beginning of a permanent breach between the Bishop and the Fathers of Charity. For several of the most promising Professors asked leave to join the Institute, including Revv. Moses Furlong and Peter Hutton, who had been among the *émigrés* from Ampleforth at the beginning, and had subsequently held important offices at Prior Park. Bishop Baines gave the requisite permission; but he had no wish to hand the College over permanently to the Fathers of Charity, and he soon arranged for their departure. Fathers Hutton and Furlong went to Italy for their novitiate; Father Pagani and others joined a new foundation of the Institute set up in 1842 at Loughborough; but the story of this will be given in a later chapter.

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.*

The Missions.

Turning now to the state of the missions and churches, we find a continuous and steady growth. During the eleven years that Dr. Griffiths was Vicar Apostolic, not a year passed without some notable development. In a letter written six months before his death, he enumerates eighteen new missions which he had opened during his episcopate; nine more where new churches had been built, besides twelve churches then in course of construction; four more which had been enlarged; and eight places where land had been secured for a future church.[1] Moreover, with the general growth of population, the London parochial clergy had become very hard worked. Dr. Griffiths estimated that the number of Catholics in London had increased during the first seven years of his episcopate by about 50,000—from 145,000 to 195,000. The converts averaged 500 a year; the remainder of the increase being due to the immigration from Ireland, or to the ordinary increase of population. As a result the clergy had more work than they could properly do. Thus, for example, according to the *Catholic Directory*,[2] 1838, at Moorfields the four priests had to look after a Catholic population estimated at 30,000. There were four "Charity Schools" to attend to, several prisons and

[1] The following is his list:—

New churches opened—1836: St. John's Wood. 1837: Brentwood and Colchester. 1838: Tunbridge Wells. 1839: Croydon, Wimbledon, Witham. 1840: Gravesend, Reading, Crayford. (1841: only Convent Chapels.) 1842: Jersey (English), Jersey (French), Saffron Hill. 1843: Islington, Hackney, Woolwich. 1844: Ryde. 1845: Deptford. New churches: Millwall, Ramsgate, Hastings, Deal, St. Albans, Swanmore, Wandsworth, Mortlake, Parson's Green. Churches in course of erection: St. George's, Kingston, Chelmsford, Guernsey, Woolhampton, Buckland, Ramsgate, Greenwich, Fulham, Farm Street, Hackney, St. Edmund's College. Churches enlarged: Spanish Chapel, Hammersmith, Kensington, Woolhampton, Southampton. Ground purchased: Poplar, Virginia Street (Commercial Road), Wandsworth, Newbury, Havant, Canterbury, Gravesend, Guildford. It will be seen that Ramsgate appears by error in two lists. Several other names are accurately included in more than one list, as for example Woolhampton, where the old chapel had been enlarged, and since then a new church had been begun. Of the above six, *viz.* Reading, Woolwich, Guernsey, Ramsgate, St. George's, and Fulham were by Pugin.

[2] The *Catholic Directory* as we know it dates from the year 1838, and was published by the well-known Catholic firm, Booker & Dolman, of New Bond Street. The old *Laity's Directory* published by Keating & Brown came to an end at the same time. In 1838 itself both appeared, but the *Laity's Directory* ceased after that year.

hospitals, and no less than twenty-four workhouses. At St. George's Fields—which since 1830 had become the Chapel of the Belgian Embassy—the number of Catholics was hardly less, and there were several prisons, workhouses, and hospitals to serve—among the latter, Guy's and St. Thomas's. Of the old Virginia Street mission in the Ratcliff Highway, we read that the three chaplains "have daily to attend the London Hospital, Mile End Road, the receptacle of all accidents in the docks, wharfs, and ships from Blackwall to London Bridge, as well as fifteen workhouses".

Dr. Griffiths in his report to Rome drew a great distinction between the London clergy and those in the country in this respect. The latter usually had a very hard Sunday, often including two Masses and two sermons; but during the week they were comparatively unoccupied—unless when they were called to a sick man at a long distance from their abode. They had little or no liturgy beyond Low Mass; even Holy Week was no exception to this, so that it was known to happen that a church might be shut all Good Friday for want of a suitable service to have. It is remarkable that priests preparing for such dissimilar posts went through their studies together at College, with precisely the same preparation in each case—not knowing in fact to which of the two lives they would be called.

It is probable that if the Pope had been better informed of the actual lives of the Secular clergy, he would have modified the letter he sent them in response to theirs mentioned in the last chapter; but if they received a severe answer, they had only themselves to thank from the tone and substance of their letter. The Pope's answer was dated St. Benedict's day (March 21, 1841). In it he expressed the pain with which he had read the complaints in their letter, and congratulated those who refused to sign it. He said he had received five or six letters from priests who declared that they would rather cut off their right hands than sign their names to such a document. "Greet them all from me," he said,[1] "and greet them one by one. Add also in my name that it is their great honour that though pressed by so many of their companions,

[1] See Appendix G where the text of a part of the letter (including this passage) is given.

though invited by the Bishop whose eager look enticed them, nevertheless with firmness of mind unimpaired and with noble persistency, they rejected all contact with guiltiness." It will be seen from this that the Pope assumed that Dr. Griffiths was one of the chief instigators of the whole business—an instance of his strange misconception, for the whole matter had been arranged at the clergy meeting at which the Bishop does not attend, and was probably carried out wholly without his knowledge. Another instance of the manner in which he was led astray in his statement that in the diocesan College, which he dignifies with the name *Vetus Aula* (Old Hall) the youths were taught that "it was a virtue to abuse the Jesuits". Alluding to the opposition of the Vicars Apostolic to the building of churches by the Regulars, he declared that he would wish to see London covered with churches, and if they could not be built with the permission of the Bishops, they should be built with that of the Sovereign Pontiff; and he expressed his confident expectation of the early conversion of England. Clearly with the Pope so misinformed, nothing remained for the clergy but to receive the letter in silence and hope for better times. In this they showed an edifying spirit; but it is doubtful whether they ever realised that by their regrettable letter they had brought it on themselves.

The state of affairs in the centres of population in the Midlands and North of England was much the same as in London. Pugin was active all over the country, and even when he was not the architect, all the new churches were built in the Gothic style. These were numerous; in a letter to the *Tablet* written in 1845, no less than thirty-five large churches built within the preceding few years outside the London District were enumerated.[1] In addition to these there were

[1] These were St. Mary's, Southport* (1837), St. Mary's, Derby* (1838), St. Mary's, Uttoxeter* (1838), St. Mary's, Dudley* (1839), St. Ann's, Keighley (1839), St. Wilfrid's, Manchester* (1839), St. Chad's, Birmingham* (1839), St. Alban's, Macclesfield* (1839), St. John's, Melton Mowbray (1839), Kiddington (1839), St. Mary's, Stockton-on-Tees (1840), St. Wilfrid's, Hulme (1840), St. Austin's, Kenilworth* (1840), The Blessed Trinity, Radford (1840), St. Mary's, Warwick Bridge* (1840), St. Winifred's, Sheepshed* (1840), St. Oswald's, Liverpool* (1840), St. John's, Alton Towers* (1840), Convent of Mercy, Handsworth, Birmingham* (1840), Sacred Heart, Acworth Grange (1841), Convent of Mercy, Liverpool* (1841), St. Giles's, Cheadle* (1841), St. Bede's, Masboro' (1841), St. Barnabas's, Nottingham* (1842), St. Andrew's, Cam-

numerous small churches, some in new missions, and the majority supported by subscription. This was especially the case in the North, where the numbers were higher. In the Midland District, however, a number of new missions and churches were due to the munificence of the Earl of Shrewsbury. As in the London District, two classes of priests were to be found—those in the cities who were overworked, and those in the country, who had a hard Sunday but little to do during the week.

The Convents.

It was in order to meet the strain to which the parochial clergy were subjected that various convents were established about this time, the early ones being chiefly in London. The Society of Charitable Sisters, a lay Association established by Dr. Poynter in 1814, was still in a flourishing condition and doing good work: but members were not numerous enough to cope with the need which was general. Moreover, it was realised that while the restrictions of enclosure or other matters by which the older Orders were bound in many cases prevented their lending effectual aid, on the other hand, the stimulus of religious vows was a necessity if the institution was to become permanent. The need had arisen in countries other than England, and numerous new religious congregations without enclosure had been established in France and elsewhere since the beginning of the century. In availing themselves of some of these, the English Bishops were only following the example of the rest of Europe.

The first foundation was made at Bermondsey. The priest there, the Rev. Peter Butler, had already shown his zeal by rebuilding the church—the new one was opened in 1835, when he had been there only three years. After this he ventured

bridge* (1842), St. Mary's, Newcastle-on-Tyne* (1842), St. Bernard's Abbey Church, Leicestershire* (1842), Northampton* (1843), Blessed Sacrament, Coventry (1843), St. Mary's, Brewood* (1843), St. Mary's, Liverpool (1844), Ushaw College* (1844), St. Mary's, Lynn* (1844), St. John's, Salford (1844), Hanley* (1844). The dates refer to when the churches were *begun*. Those marked with an asterisk were designed by Pugin. The list is by no means exhaustive: the domestic chapel at Grace Dieu, for example, is as worthy of mention as that at Alton Towers; both were open to the public. Pugin's churches in the London District are included in the list on p. 177.

to put a scheme before Dr. Griffiths for founding a Convent of Sisters of Mercy. The Bishop entered cordially into his scheme, and forthwith began to take steps to give effect to it.

The Sisters of Mercy originated in Ireland, having been established by the well-known Miss Catharine Macaulay. The first house was opened in Lower Baggot Street, Dublin, under the patronage of Archbishop Murray, in 1827, and it grew so rapidly that many other houses were soon established. Their work was to be teaching in schools, visiting the sick, and helping in missionary work among the poor. A feature of the Congregation is that each house is independent, and elects its own superiors, so that there is no Provincial or General. Among the first group of English ladies who offered themselves was Lady Barbara Eyre, a member of an old Catholic family, and she brought with her a dowry of £1,000, which was made the beginning of a fund for building a convent, Pugin being the architect. Dr. Griffiths arranged for the first group to go to Ireland for their novitiate, but subsequent novices were to be provided for at their own convent, which would by that time be in working order, and was in fact completed in 1839.

The work of the sisters was much appreciated, and a second house was soon opened North of the Thames, at Queen's Square, Bloomsbury, and a little later one at Chelsea. Soon afterwards, by the munificence of Mr. Hardman of Birmingham, the well-known Convent of Mercy at Handsworth was founded; and another at Liverpool; and a little later one at Bristol.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd opened their house at Hammersmith for the reception of female penitents in 1841. Other congregations also assisted in the work of education, which was already being carried on by the communities of the older Orders who had come to England during the Revolution. The Benedictine schools at Hammersmith,[1] Caverswall,[2] Stanbrook, Princethorpe,[3] and Winchester,[4] etc., were all doing good

[1] This community was removed in 1862 to Teignmouth, and now do not carry on any school.

[2] Now at Oulton Abbey, Staffordshire.

[3] The ancient French community of Montargis finally settled at Princethorpe near Coventry in 1833, where they still are; but they have now become completely anglicised.

[4] Since removed to East Bergholt, Suffolk. They do not now carry on a school.

work, as well as the Sepulchrines at New Hall, and the old English school at Micklegate Bar, York, conducted by the Institute of Mary. These were now to be supplemented by more modern educational orders. The congregation of the "Faithful Companions" had undertaken the care of the Orphanage at Somerstown since about 1830; in 1841 they opened their well-known school at Gumley House, Isleworth. The following year saw the establishment of the Society of the Sacré Cœur at Acton. After this we find the Presentation Sisters established at London and Manchester; the Notre Dame Sisters in the West of England; the Sisters of the Holy Child at Derby; the Sisters of Providence at Loughborough; and others both in London and the Provinces. All this had already taken place in the lifetime of Dr. Griffiths, who thus lived to see the foundation laid for the extraordinary multiplication of convents and religious houses which has gone rapidly forward down to the present day.

Church Services and Music.

Before leaving the description of the missions, some short account should be given of the Church services, and especially of the Church music. This was at that date of the most florid type, and such as would now be considered unworthy of its sacred object. All the most celebrated singers of the Italian Opera—the majority of whom were Catholics—were to be heard during the season in the London churches. The Bavarian Chapel at Warwick Street became so celebrated in this respect that it earned for itself the title of the "Shilling Opera"—that being the price of the best seats. The Masses of Mozart and Haydn were performed with great elaboration, sometimes accompanied by a full orchestra. Pieces such as Zingarelli's *Laudate pueri Dominum* were always popular. Rossini's *Stabat Mater*, written in 1841, at once took a permanent place in London church music; and the simple and light music of Webbe was still often heard at Mass and Vespers.

All the various canons to which in our own time the Pope has called attention in his celebrated *Motu Proprio* were infringed. The singers were of both sexes, indiscriminately

mixed together in an organ gallery, often many of them being non-Catholic, so that the anomaly of the *Credo* being sung by unbelievers was of frequent occurrence. Then the *Gloria* and *Credo* were divided into a number of small pieces—the *Gratias Agimus*, the *Qui tollis*, and the like—with different singers apportioned for each, so that in some of the very select choirs the most important performers would come and sing their own piece and then go away. On special occasions the music would be advertised as though it was to be a concert.

A prominent instance may be mentioned when Signor Lanzo, the choirmaster at Warwick Street, wrote a Mass for the avowed object of relieving the monotony of "the eternal Mozart and Haydn". His Mass contained all the characteristics alluded to above, and among his performers were Madame Malibran, the famous *prima donna*, Madame Garcia, also well known, and Signori Rubini, Begrez, Garcia, Tamburini, and La Blache—the last named being the celebrated *buffo* at the Italian Opera. The full score of the Mass was published at £1 4s., and dedicated to Dr. Griffiths. The *Gloria* made no less than eight separate pieces, and so on with the rest.

The following account of a Whit Sunday High Mass at the old Sardinian Chapel, Lincoln's Inn Fields—which had been duly advertised in advance—is quite characteristic of the state of affairs then in vogue :—[1]

"A little after eleven o'clock (Signori Rubini and La Blache being in the choir) the grand instrumental High Mass composed by the Maestro di Capella began with the sublime *Kyrie*, which finished as the priests got to the *Gloria*, when Mr. Le Jeune, the Organist, commenced the splendid *Gloria* with a trumpet, well supported by the remainder of the band. It is a masterly composition, and Signor di Angeli has shown great musical talent in this piece, for it might be compared with any of Mozart's or Haydn's. Signor Rubini sang the admirable *Quoniam* with great effect. It was more like the warbling of a bird than mere singing, for it must have astonished as well as delighted the whole congregation, among whom were many Protestants. The *Gloria* was followed by the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, most beautifully sung by Signor La

[1] *Orthodox Journal*, June 8, 1839, p. 358.

Blache. To say the most of the *Credo* in a few words, it excelled the *Gloria*, and was supported by Madame Persiani and Signor Tamburini, who came in during the sermon. The Offertory was appropriated to Madame Persiani, who certainly sang it both sweetly and elegantly. The remainder of the Mass was in the same style as the beginning."

A still more flagrant instance may be quoted in the *Requiem* for the sister of Madame Grisi, the celebrated Opera singer, at Lincoln's Inn Fields in July, 1840, which produced a long correspondence of protest in the *Tablet*. It had been advertised beforehand as though it were an entertainment. All the best Opera singers, who were mentioned by name, were to take part, the music being Mozart's *Requiem*. Admission was by ticket only, and the proceeds were to be devoted to the benefit of the mission. When the time came the church was well filled, the majority of those present being Protestants, and as the expenses were all borne by Madame Grisi, a good sum was paid over to the mission.

Dr. Griffiths realised the objection to this class of performance as strongly as anyone. When it was desired to raise money for Moorfields church, by his wish there was no religious service of any kind. The performance became similar to an Oratorio, and the Blessed Sacrament not being present, there was little to object to. When High Mass was going on, however, he felt that such exhibitions were out of place. At St. Edmund's College he more than once insisted on exclusive plain chant, and at various times he issued regulations as to the London churches. In a pastoral in 1846, for example, he wrote as follows:—

"As the edification of Protestants and the piety of the faithful are much more promoted by the solemn worship of God, particularly in the sanctuary, than by theatrical pieces of music, of which the announcement in the public journals is very disedifying, we especially recommend great solemnity in all the public offices of religion. . . . We suggest that when appropriate Masses cannot be sung without females, that two should sing in unison where the solos occur; this will confine the singing to the notes themselves, and prevent an exhibition of voice frequently too light and worldly and distracting for the presence of the Holy of Holies on our altars."

These rules, however, were often broken, and Dr. Griffiths was slow to interfere too much, if only because in some cases the priest could not afford to do without such music—for it was a great source of revenue. An interesting article written by Lingard in the *Catholic Magazine* for May, 1843,[1] puts the matter fairly and candidly:—

"It should always be borne in mind," he writes, "that our chapels are entirely maintained by voluntary subscriptions. For the support of the clergy, for the pomp and solemnity of Divine worship, it is absolutely necessary that large funds should be provided, and to effect that purpose, it is usually indispensable to put forth such inducements as fine music and fine singing intrinsically possess to attract a multitude that will pay as well as pray. If it be taken into consideration that on a Sunday morning, from an early hour, the Catholic clergy are unceasingly engaged in solemnising Masses, which are attended by successive congregations of the poorer classes, we shall be less disposed to cavil at a system which, however defective it may be, furnishes the means of so much edification. The plain English of the matter seems to be that in order to preserve the worship of the Catholic Church in a state of efficiency in a country of which the law neither allows her the enjoyment of any temporalities of her own, nor contributes in any manner to the maintenance of her religious fabrics, or the stipends of her ministers, we must pay a high price for the privilege of attending the worship of our forefathers, and for securing the facilities of doing so to our indigent and pious brethren."

A little later he proceeds to describe the evils—even scandals—incidental to the system as then in force:—

"We must in candour declare from our own experience and observation that things do occasionally take place among the salaried choirs of our London chapels, by which the eye and the ear are alike distracted from legitimate subjects of devotion. Behind those partially drawn curtains that veil from view the unbonneted heads of the fair choristers, and which have perhaps the counter effect of rather stimulating the curiosity they were designed to repress, how many a whispered conversation, and smothered laugh, and furtive glance have we at times

[1] p. 291.

detected, to our own exceeding discomposure! Have we not beheld an organist regaling himself with a Sunday newspaper during the progress of the sermon? or, with other members of the choir, deliberately walking forth from the chapel at the commencement of the discourse, and timing their return with the utmost nicety for the commencement of the Nicene Creed? Has it not been our fate, in consequence no doubt of the accidental absence upon that luckless occasion of the legitimate *prima donna*, to hear a soprano *Incarnatus* attempted in falsetto by the base voice of an eminent comic singer, whose very face irresistibly called up associations of mirth and conviviality? Have we not seen with our own eyes eminent 'artistes' walk arm in arm and with much seeming gravity and decorum, into the choir of a London chapel, although these very parties were at the time labouring under the world's imputation of living together in a state unhallowed alike by the laws of God and Man?"

Lingard concludes his article by an interesting, though short, consideration of the effect of English hymns. "For our own part," he writes, "we believe that as subsidiary to, not supplementary of, the Latin services of the Church, the practice of introducing hymns in our native language might be rendered highly instrumental in the promotion of piety and edification. We were peculiarly impressed with this conviction upon the occasion of assisting at Midnight Mass at a Convent in France. The whole religious and a large lay community received holy Communion, and during the time occupied by the administration of that sacrament, a French harmonized hymn was sung by all the nuns, with a devotional spirit and effect that took every right feeling captive.[1]"

At the churches in the provincial towns the music was naturally somewhat less ambitious. The staple source of supply was Webbe's miscellaneous book, which was always to be found in every church of importance. In the domestic chapels supported by the gentry, there was sometimes a trained choir, but in the ordinary chapels in the country towns or villages there was rarely any music at all. A large proportion of these chapels were in Lancashire and its vicinity,

[1] It is well known that Lingard is the author of one of the most popular of our English hymns—"Hail, Queen of Heaven".

where there were still some whose families had always remained Catholic. The following typical description was written by Dr. Gradwell when in Rome, some fifteen or twenty years before the time with which we are now dealing, but there is no reason to think that it was otherwise than applicable in the year 1840. He writes as follows:—[1]

"As there is but one Mass in a parish, all the parishioners must attend at the church at the same time. It is a beautiful and edifying sight on a Sunday or holiday morning to see all the Catholic population of the neighbourhood, rich and poor, old and young, to the amount of from 100 to 1,000 persons, all assembling in their Sunday dress at the same hour, and all staying the whole time of Divine service with order, silence, attention, and devotion. In some churches the Mass is sung, but except in London and the colleges, without deacon and subdeacon, because there are none. The service is commonly as follows. The priest reads devotions in the vernacular tongue, *Pater*, *Ave*, *Credo*, *De profundis*, Acts of the Theological Virtues, Litany of the B.V.M., or select antiphons, psalms, and prayers, chiefly translated from the Divine Office. Then he reads the Epistle and Gospel of the day, and preaches or reads an instruction on them. Then follows Mass, and catechistical instruction, unless the catechism forms part of the afternoon Devotions and Instructions. For eight days and sometimes more at the eight principal festivals of the year, there is plenary indulgence for those who duly frequent the sacraments of Penance and Communion. These duties are diligently observed. This common assembling of all together has good effects. It forms the whole congregation into one family, brings them all to the regular Instruction and Devotion, and while it guards them from heresy, infuses the love of Catholic religion and Catholic piety."

The Blundell Legacy.

The money requisite for building all these churches represented a constant stream of charity from the old Catholics. Practically all the new missions belonged to the class described in the *Directory* as "supported by subscriptions, donations,

[1] Gradwell Letter Book (*Westminster Archives*).

or legacies by will". The last-named class of donations was often a substantial assistance; but it not infrequently led to difficulties and misunderstandings with the surviving relatives. A prominent instance of this occurred in the well-known Blundell legacy case, in which the Bishops received one of the largest sums of any in modern times; but it led to litigation, which lasted for several years.[1] This was due to the state of the law at the time, which accounted legacies which were indirectly concerned with Masses as "superstitious uses," and consequently null and void. Hence it was usual to leave any money so destined to individuals by name, and in the event of the nominal legatees dying before the legacy fell in, difficulties were always liable to occur. In the present case the testator was Mr. Charles Blundell, of Ince Hall, Lancashire. He died on October 30, 1837, leaving in addition to various specific legacies a large residue of his estate, amounting to over £200,000, to Dr. Walsh and Dr. Bramston, intending it of course not for their personal use, but for the good of religion in their respective districts. At the outset the whole will was disputed by the surviving relatives, and in order to avoid expense and the risk of the law—which in those days for a Catholic priest or Bishop was a very real one—a compromise was agreed to by which about one-third of the residue was accepted.

Then came the real difficulty. As the testator survived Dr. Bramston by more than a year, Dr. Walsh became entitled at law to the whole. In view, however, of the known wishes of the testator, he felt bound to pay over half of the legacy to Dr. Griffiths, and made a formal promise to do so; while in consideration of any possible doubt on the subject, Dr. Griffiths agreed to accept certain other legacies—the chief being one of £15,000 to the London clergy—as part of his share, and after certain other readjustments, the net distribution was to be £28,000 to Dr. Griffiths and £42,000 to Dr. Walsh. This was agreed to with all formality, in the presence of witnesses, but no deed was thought necessary.

In 1839 the case between the heir-at-law and next-of-kin was heard in the Chancery Court, and some fresh facts came to light as to Mr. Blundell's subsequent intentions for a new

[1] See Appendix J, where various documents are given, presenting the case from both points of view.

will showing that, as matters stood, he was aware that Dr. Walsh would be legally entitled to the whole residue. With characteristic vacillation, Dr. Walsh used this plea to go back on his former agreement, and he claimed the whole legacy. He even filed a bill in Chancery against Dr. Griffiths. Dr. Wiseman on his arrival took the same view, and maintained that the case should be referred to Rome. Dr. Griffiths maintained that the new facts were not material; that there was no definite evidence of a formed intention on the part of the testator to make a new will; that even if the new will story were accepted, Dr. Walsh was to have been cut out as much as himself—though this cannot be certainly established, as the proposed new conditions were changed and re-changed. In any case Dr. Griffiths maintained that it was too late to re-open the question, as he had, with Dr. Walsh's knowledge and approval, raised and spent large sums of money on the security of his expectation. He wrote an answer, but did not file it in Chancery, hoping that the matter might be settled out of court.

It is not a little remarkable, as showing the prejudice against Dr. Griffiths in Rome, that Cardinal Fransoni wrote to him, demanding an explanation of his having attacked a brother Bishop in the law courts, as though he had been the aggressor. Of course he had a triumphant answer: the fault, if any, was on the side of Dr. Walsh, for it was he, not Dr. Griffiths, who had filed the bill. Both parties, however, were unwilling that the case should be heard in Rome, owing to the difficulty and expense of getting the witnesses there; and the agreement having been verbal, the presence of witnesses was essential. Eventually the matter was referred to arbitration, the judges being two Scotch Vicars Apostolic and four priests from Lancashire and its neighbourhood. They held their sittings at Green's Hotel, Lincoln's Inn Fields, in August, 1841, and after an exhaustive inquiry, lasting over eight days, they decided unanimously in favour of Dr. Griffiths, but left each side to pay its own costs—amounting in Dr. Griffiths's case to over £1,500.

Dr. Walsh was very dissatisfied with the award, especially as the arbitrators refused to give their reasons for the conclusions they had come to. He printed a pamphlet—said to have

been composed by Mr. Henry Bagshawe, his counsel—giving his own side of the case. It is due to him to add, however, that when the money was paid in the following year he made no further difficulty, and handed over Dr. Griffiths's share without any delay or question.[1]

It was probably in view of this case, which caused considerable stir, that Pugin wrote a vigorous denunciation of the legacy system. In his illustration we see all the main features of the Blundell case shining through :—[2]

"The moment a rich old fellow dies," he writes, "all the relations to the nineteenth degree turn up and assemble, and if they understand his money has been left to the Church, the indignation is general. Was there ever such a monstrous thing known, when he had so many relatives, and some so slenderly provided for? One of his nephews had married on the strength of his expectations, and was now burdened with a numerous family, who would be wholly without fortunes. Another had enlarged his dining-room and built a conservatory on the same grounds, and this money to go to the Bishops; they would not allow it, they will have law. A lawyer is present and steps forward; he quite agrees; it is certainly a case for a British jury; he would be happy to conduct it himself; though a Catholic, he considers family interests should be protected. Proceedings are begun and to prevent scandal and expense, and the glorious uncertainty of the law, half the property is made over in a compromise, and is the speedy cause of a dozen secondary suits among the relations themselves, who do not consider that they are fairly dealt with by each other. And now another Bishop considers he has a prior claim or equal right on the residue. The first Bishop cannot admit the justice of the premises. It must be referred

[1] Under the will as eventually carried out, Oscott profited to the extent of £5,000; St. Edmund's College, £4,000, and the London clergy, £14,000; Dr. Griffiths, £28,200, and Dr. Walsh, £42,200. There was also a legacy of £4,000 to Downside. The legacy to the London clergy was to be invested and the income annually distributed. According to the number of priests then in London this came to about £10 each—a useful increase in their income. At the present day the dividends are still distributed, but owing to the large increase in the number of clergy, each priest receives a very small sum.

Further particulars of this complicated will case are given in Appendix J.

[2] Ferrey's *Recollections of Pugin*, Appendix by Purcell, p. 382, where Pugin's words are given, but without any reference.

to arbitration. Grave men travel up to London, put up at first-rate hotels, keep up good cheer, drive about in glass coaches, see sights, and occasionally sit in a back room round a green baize table. Portly and sinewy lawyers, with attendants bearing blue bags full of documents, read long extracts from interminable deeds. Rejoinder next day, all the preceding arguments demolished, time is up, but to-morrow the first party will again address on fresh grounds. Days go by, one week gone, hotel bills running on, the cost of a small parochial church in the second pointed style swallowed up already, proceedings become a bore, a compromise proposed, could not two mutual friends settle it? They agree, divide again, and deduct expenses. Only one-third of the whole sum, reduced by subdivision to a very moderate amount. Both Bishops reported to be immensely rich and to have received an inexhaustible fortune, no subscriptions in consequence. Pious ladies are astonished that anything should be expected of them under such circumstances. Both Bishops set forth, what is quite true, that the sum received was so reduced as to be comparatively small. Nobody believes it, or if they do, they pretend they do not, and excuse themselves for not giving on those grounds. Both Bishops are considerably minus at the end of the year that the great benefaction fell in."

The Marriage Act of 1836.

An important development in Catholic life was the passing of the Marriage Act in 1836, by which all marriages celebrated in licensed Catholic churches[1] in the presence of a civil Registrar were valid at law, and the disagreeable necessity of going through the service also in a Protestant church before an Anglican minister, which had existed since 1753, finally came to an end. And at the same time the civil publication of bans, a notice posted in the Registry Office not less than twenty-one days in advance, was to be deemed valid at law. A bill to this effect had been introduced by Sir Robert Peel in

[1] The registration of certain churches for marriage, which continues in force at the present day, is the remaining survival of the clause in the Catholic Relief Act of 1791, which required all Catholic places of worship to be registered before the Clerk of the Peace.

the previous year, but owing to the fall of his Government the final passing of the Act—which included also the establishment of regular registration of births and deaths—was due to Lord Melbourne's Government.

The Act was not indeed designed to relieve Catholics, being meant chiefly for dissenters, or others who objected to being forced to go through the Anglican rite; and in fact it created the Registry Office, rendering a civil marriage possible without church service of any kind. Incidentally, however, it conferred no small boon on Catholics, and one for which they had for long been crying out. It was indeed arguable that the presence of a Catholic couple in a Protestant church for the purpose of making the marriage valid at law did not constitute any real joining in Protestant worship. Cardinal Manning explained this in his Address at the Fourth Provincial Synod of Westminster at St. Edmund's College in 1873:—

"So long as penal laws inflicted religious nullity upon all Catholic marriages unless they were solemnised before the minister of the Established Church, Catholics were compelled to go before them to obtain the legal validity of their marriages and the legal security of their estates. But they went before the minister of the Established Church not as a minister of religion, but as a civil authority, and for civil effects. Their Catholic marriage was the only marriage they recognised as perfect before God and man; but for its civil recognition and legal validity they were compelled by penal laws to appear before the appointed civil officer, who was also a minister of the established religion."

Although, however, this view could be theoretically maintained, in practice it was naturally confusing to the average Catholic who was not skilled in the principles of theology. Moreover, in the case of mixed marriages, when the service was performed in both Catholic and Protestant church, the practical impression was almost irresistible that the Protestant service was tolerated for the Protestant party as the Catholic service was for the Catholic party, and that they were regarded as of equal value—a position which the Church could never explicitly sanction. Hence the Vicars Apostolic were thankful to be able to issue new instructions reforming the practice. They also brought into force at this time

the normal law of the Church as to "mixed marriages"—or marriages between a Catholic and a non-Catholic Christian—only tolerating them subject to the consent of the non-Catholic party for *all* the children to be brought up as Catholics. From that time therefore the custom which had hitherto been informally tolerated that the boys should follow the religion of their father, and the girls that of their mother, was no longer allowed, though some time elapsed before the prohibition could be universally enforced.

Thus Cardinal Manning continues: "When in 1836 this penal law was abolished, and the validity of Catholic marriages with the presence of the Registrar was legalised, the Registrar took the place of the Protestant clergyman, as the Protestant clergyman had until then discharged the office of the Registrar. From that moment the necessity of appearing before him ceased for all civil effects, and no other lawful motive for a Catholic to appear before him could exist. Thenceforward he could only be regarded as a minister of religion; and to go before him for any such religious act, and especially for matrimony, which a Catholic knows to be a Sacrament, has ever been and ever must be forbidden as an act intrinsically sinful."

Although, however, Catholics were unreservedly pleased at being relieved of their attendance in the Protestant church, the alternative provided was not to their liking. Hitherto after performing the civil function at the Protestant church they had had their own service in their own church undisturbed.[1] Henceforth there was to be a civil officer present all the time, who was to receive the signatures of the parties for purposes of registration. This they considered derogatory to the dignity of the officiating priest, besides being an inconvenience, especially in cases of solemn marriage when the nuptial Mass was celebrated and the ceremony lasted over an

[1] The Catholic marriage sometimes preceded the ceremony in the Protestant church, and that was undoubtedly the right order; but it made the officiating priest become liable to civil penalties. Hence the other order was usually adopted. A few indeed followed Bishop Milner in thinking that this was unlawful, as the parties were validly married in a Protestant church, and the Catholic ceremony became nugatory; but the general consensus of opinion was the other way. The two ceremonies—the civil and the religious—were looked upon as one moral act.

hour. During the passage of the Act, Dr. Griffiths had numerous interviews with the Registrar-General, in which he urged that a clause should be added enabling the Catholic priest himself to be a registrar; or at any rate that there should be Catholic registrars for Catholic churches. To this the Registrar-General declared that the Government would not agree, but it was suggested as an alternative that the priest should have a consultative voice in the nomination of any registrar to attend in his church. This suggestion, however, did not come to anything, and in the end the Act was passed substantially in the form in which we know it at the present day. Now that Catholics have grown accustomed to the presence of the registrar, and that laws for civil marriages have been passed in nearly all the countries, it is no longer felt as a grievance, nor even a serious inconvenience: for in our own time the very provision asked for has been granted, and the priests can become their own registrars; yet their doing so has been discountenanced, if not actually forbidden, by the Bishops.

Work of the Laity.

We must now add a word about the work of the laity at this time, and the encouragement which it received at the hands of the Vicars Apostolic. In the same way as had happened on several previous occasions during the sixty or seventy years then elapsed, it began to occur to the leaders among the Catholic laity that they had no proper organisation to give them cohesion and strength. The doings of the former representative bodies of Catholics must have been known to some of them, but apparently were only vaguely remembered. The memory of the ill-famed Catholic Committee of 1782-92 had been kept up by the Cisalpine Club which had been founded at the time of the dissolution of the Committee; and this body still existed, under its new title of the Emancipation Club, and continued until the year 1847, when it was finally dissolved. Its constitution, like that of the Committee, was aristocratic and select; but since the dissolution of the Committee in 1792 all claim to a representative character had been given up. The next representative

body was the Catholic Board, which was founded in 1808 and lasted until 1822. This body claimed to be representative, but it was not exclusive. Any Catholic could become a member by subscribing to the funds, the amount of the subscription not being specified, and the Vicars Apostolic were all *ipso facto* members. The Board was followed by the British Catholic Association, which was founded in 1823, and was open to anyone who paid an annual subscription of £1. It did some good work; but it came to an end in consequence of a disagreement about "securities" just at the time when the Emancipation Bill was passing.[1]

Now in 1838 it was proposed to make one more attempt to secure a permanent organisation among the Catholic laity, the leading spirit being Hon. Charles Langdale, M.P. for Knaresborough, afterwards so well known as a Catholic leader. The new Society was to be called the Catholic Institute. But it was hardly to be considered even a new Society, for it grew out of the Metropolitan Catholic Tract Society, much in the same way as the Catholic Board had grown out of a similar society in 1808.[2] The Catholic Tract Society had been established before the passing of Emancipation by the well-known William Eusebius Andrews, in order to raise a fund to publish answers to the numerous Protestant calumnies which were issued broadcast. The Society did some very good work for a while; but at this time it was languishing. Andrews died in 1837, and it seemed as though the Metropolitan Tract Society would soon come to an end, when the idea was started to reconstruct it on a broader basis.

From this it will be seen that the first and principal object of the Institute was to circulate cheap literature in answer to Protestant calumnies. This was, however, far from being its only function. In the list of its objects as originally drawn up, we find that the same end was to be aimed at by writing in the public press, by organising Catholic lectures, or lending libraries, etc. It was likewise to defend the legal rights of Catholics, to assist in the support of Catholic schools, and even to collect money for the erection of new churches. When this programme was put before the Bishops, however,

[1] See *Eve of Catholic Emancipation*, iii., pp. 243 and 268.
[2] *Ibid.*, i., p. 99.

at their York meeting in the spring of 1838, they struck out the last-named object, adding by way of explanation that they thought "the work of erecting chapels too intricate and various to be successfully managed by a general Committee". With respect to the main object of the Institute they wrote:—[1]

"We fully agree with you that prejudice and bigotry are awakened and increased by the means to which your letter refers, and we think it high time that there should be a general association among us to oppose the efforts of these promoters of bigotry. We are at the same time anxious that our good and holy religion should be defended in a dignified manner, and that in the tracts and other publications that shall issue from our press there should be nothing low or violent. To prevent this evil arising, as also to secure the orthodoxy and sound morality of these tracts and other publications, we deem it necessary that they shall all be submitted to the inspection of an ecclesiastic who shall be named by the Vicar Apostolic of London."

In the last proviso we can see clearly enough the anxiety of the Bishops to guard against the literature of the scurrilous type of the old *Orthodox Journal* or the *Truthteller*. But in fact the apprehension was groundless, for the Society was passing into the hands of persons of a different type, whose danger would be inaction rather than indiscretion, and who were not in the least likely to imitate the original promoter.

The Committee of the new Institute of course gave way to the Bishops, and formulated the object of the new Society as "the exposure of the falsehood of the calumnious charges made against the Catholic religion, the defence of the real tenets of Catholicity, the circulation of all useful knowledge on the afore-mentioned subjects; and the protection of the poorer classes of Catholics in the enjoyment of their religious principles and practices".

The Institute was formally established in the summer of 1838. The Earl of Shrewsbury was elected President. All the Bishops and Clergy were to become *ipso facto* members, "without any contribution save what they may voluntarily choose to give". Among the laity the subscription was six-

[1] *Catholic Magazine*, June, 1838, p. 374.

HON. CHARLES LANGDALE

From a water-colour sketch at Houghton Hall, by kind permission of Lord Mowbray and Stourton

pence a month, or six shillings a year. Anyone paying this modest sum had a right to become a member. There was to be an annual meeting in London; but there were also to be branch meetings in the chief provincial towns.

The first annual meeting was held at the Freemasons' Hall on June 6, 1839. The room was crowded, and it had the nature of a public meeting. A prominent feature was the presence on the same platform of Daniel O'Connell and persons such as Lord Stourton, his brother the Hon. Charles Langdale,[1] and other members of the old Catholic aristocracy, most of whom would have been strongly opposed to him politically. The tie which bound them together was their religion, and the people so far entered into the spirit of the occasion that we are told that all the principal leaders were received with acclamation equal to that which O'Connell himself received. The Liberator made a very democratic speech. After congratulating the English Catholics for having at length organised themselves, he called upon them to establish subscriptions analogous to the so-called "Catholic Rent" in Ireland, which had proved such a success. He said that there were a million Catholics in England. He called on each one to subscribe a shilling a year, or a penny a month; or as he afterwards put it, "a farthing a week, with four weeks free". If this was kept up, there would, he said, be an income of nearly £50,000 a year. He pointed out that a similar system was in force among the Methodists, with good results; and if Catholics were to imitate them, every one would feel that he was personally helping in the great work.

Among the other speakers were Charles Langdale, Charles Weld, Rev. Thomas Sisk, Chisholm Anstey, etc. When the meeting was over a grand dinner was held, at which O'Connell took the chair, and the same good spirit prevailed throughout. And when the balance sheet was published it showed an income of over £850 in subscriptions. Rarely if ever has a Catholic work of this nature been founded with a greater appearance of promise for the future.

[1] The Hon. Charles Langdale who was for many years the leader of the Catholic laity, was the fourth son of Charles Philip, 17th Lord Stourton, by the Hon. May Langdale, second daughter and sole heir of the 5th and last Lord Langdale. He was born in 1787, and took the name of Langdale in 1814.

Among the Provincial towns in which branches were established may be mentioned Liverpool, Manchester, York, Darlington, North and South Shields, Leicester, Norwich, Bury St. Edmund's, Bath, Lyme Regis, etc., besides several branches in and around London.

Before the time for the second annual meeting, the Pope sent a letter to the Earl of Shrewsbury, giving his formal approbation to the Institute. The meeting was held on May 26, 1840, at the Freemasons' Hall as before, and was even more successful than its predecessor. O'Connell was there again, and declared that it was "a glorious day for England". Charles Langdale was in the chair—a position he frequently occupied at representative Catholic meetings for the rest of his life,—and the leading English Catholic laymen enumerated as present were:—

Lords Stourton, Stafford, Camoys, and Lovat; Mr. P. Howard, M.P., Hon. Charles Clifford, Mr. Weld of Lulworth, Mr. Jones of Llanarth Court, Mr. Wheble of Woodley Lodge, Mr. Lawson of Brough Hall, Mr. Tempest, Mr. Charles Towneley, Mr. Stanley Constable, Mr. Charles Stapleton, Mr. Ferdinand Eyston, Mr. H. Bagshawe, Mr. Frederick Lucas, etc., etc.

Accession of Queen Victoria.

We ought not to conclude this chapter without some allusion to the accession to the throne of Queen Victoria, whose long reign of sixty-three years was destined to be so eventful in the history of the Catholic Revival in England. She came to the throne as a young Queen on the death of her uncle on June 20, 1837. The Coronation took place in Westminster Abbey the following year, on June 28, and as this is the Vigil of Sts. Peter and Paul and ordinarily a fast day, the Vicars Apostolic showed their public sense of loyalty by dispensing with the fast. In accordance, however, with the customary view then in vogue, they did not abolish it altogether, but only altered its date to the previous day.

It is instructive to notice that even in those early days Catholics began to show a sense of their Emancipation, and to resent the anti-Catholic Declaration which a Sovereign was called upon to make at the outset of a new reign—in this

case at the opening of her first Parliament, on November 20, 1837. An anonymous pamphlet was issued, protesting against it. It took the form of a letter to the Lord Chancellor, and the authorship was afterwards acknowledged by Lingard. His argument throughout is forcible and represented strong feeling on the part of his co-religionists. The English Catholics had always been distinguished for their loyalty to the Crown, and they felt that this was an insulting reply for the Sovereign to make to them.

"The declaration, let it be observed," wrote Lingard,[1] "is not a mere profession of belief in the doctrines of one Church and of disbelief in the doctrine of another. It goes much further: it condemns in the most solemn manner the worship and practices of the greatest body of Christians in the world, and assigns to them, without any redeeming qualification, the epithets of superstitious and idolatrous. Now it was thought both cruel and indecorous to exact such declaration and condemnation from the Queen on that occasion, considering on the one hand her youth, and on the other the diligence of enquiry and the maturity of judgment which the proceeding on her part pre-supposed."

Looking at it from the point of view of the Catholics themselves, he proceeded:—

"Of all the insults which may be offered to a man in his character of Christian, the most offensive by far is to brand him with the infamous name of an idolater. Yet this odious imputation was our young and amiable Sovereign compelled to cast on the whole body of Roman Catholics in England, Scotland, Ireland, and her transmarine dominions—a body comprising at the lowest computation nine millions of her subjects."

But he pointed out that it went further still, and he gave a sort of *reductio ad absurdum*:—

"The declaration comprehends in its sweeping censure the whole Roman Catholic world; and therefore by it the Queen was made to pronounce her beloved friend, the royal consort of her uncle of Belgium, an idolater; her sister Queens of Spain and Portugal idolaters; her ally the King of the French

[1] The quotations are taken from the original edition. It was subsequently republished, with some changes, in the *Dublin Review*.

as idolater. Of the four parties to the quadruple all but herself are in the meaning of the declaration idolaters."

"But the fault is not in her," he proceeded, "she acted by the advice of her counsellors, and under the control of an Act of Parliament. The fault lies in the system—a system which originated in passion or policy during a period of religious excitement, but which has been long giving way before the gradual development of more tolerant principles."

In fact the royal declaration was but a survival of what used to be imposed on all members of Parliament. They had for some years been relieved of the obligation, and it was high time that the Sovereign should also be relieved from what at best was a form devoid of any efficacious result. "There cannot be a man so obtuse"—Lingard wrote—"as to believe that the Queen was either less a Protestant before or became more a Protestant after she had subscribed the declaration."

Unfortunately the Catholics, emancipated though they were, had not enough influence to make their voice heard, and Lingard's protest passed unheeded. Public feeling was still very anti-Catholic and it found its reflection in the acts of the Queen. Soon after her marriage with Prince Albert, the royal couple on their journey from London to Cambridge passed the lodge of St. Edmund's College. The occasion was taken for a display of Catholic loyalty. A triumphal arch was erected on the road where they were to pass, and the President and students assembled to give them a welcome. It was proposed to read an address; but the Queen refused to receive it. The most she consented to do was to drive slowly past, so that the Collegians might have the opportunity of cheering.

By the end of her long reign public opinion had to great extent changed. At the accession of her son Edward VII. the declaration was a burning question. He indeed made it—those who heard him said that he went through it in an almost inaudible voice—but he was the last Sovereign to make it at all. Before his son succeeded him, Catholics had asserted themselves, and it had been abolished. This is only one of many ways in which public opinion changed for the better on behalf of Catholics during the long and prosperous reign of Queen Victoria.

Yet curiously, almost at the beginning of it, the question

of the prayers for the Queen in Catholic churches was brought prominently forward, with a view to reducing them. During penal days the Vicars Apostolic had gone somewhat further than was justified by liturgical rules in praying for a non-Catholic by name. In one District at least the name of the Sovereign had been inserted in the Canon of the Mass, as though he was a Catholic king.[1] The ordinary usage was to say the psalm *Exaudiat*, with versicle and prayer after Mass. Something similar is done in our times, and as it is outside the Mass no exception is taken. But there was also a custom in England of adding a special post-communion every Sunday, in which the Sovereign Pontiff and the Civil rulers were prayed for by name; and the bracketing of these in the same prayer also seemed to put the King on a level with a Catholic sovereign.[2]

From the first Dr. Wiseman took exception to this as unrubrical, as the following interesting extract from a letter to Dom Joseph Brown, dated September 21, 1840, shows :—[3]

"As to the Post-Communion, 'Et famulos tuos,' the Pope (consulted by Dr. Baines) has to me and to Dr. Baines most unequivocally condemned it, and ordered it to be discontinued, though by private communication to the priests (so as to avoid exciting political jealousies). He expressed his great astonishment that he and the Protestant Sovereign could be prayed for in the same terms and same prayer, and the latter be thus prayed for *in* the Mass, a point he had refused to the Belgian Bishops in favour of their king. Dr. Milner would never allow it in his District, and it has never been used here. I never could bring myself to say it when I have visited England, as I believed it an abuse."

The post-communion for the Queen, however, was continued in the London District throughout the lifetime of Dr. Griffiths.

[1] See Bishop Walmesley's pastoral quoted by Amherst, i., p. 110.

[2] The prayer was printed on the altar card on the Epistle side. The following is the text:—

"Oratio Postcommunioni Addenda.

"Et famulos tuos N. Papam, N. Antistitem nostrum, N. regem nostrum, cum domo regia, cum populo et exercitu ipsi commissis, ab omni adversitate custodi; pacem tuam nostris concede temporibus, et ab Ecclesia tua cunctam repelle nequitiam. Per Dominum."

[3] *Downside Archives.*

He wrote to Rome explaining the difficulty of discontinuing a practice to which the people were so accustomed, and apparently the continuance was tolerated. It was not finally abolished until Dr. Wiseman had become Archbishop. At the same time the prayers for the Queen after Mass were shortened, but in their shortened form were made obligatory.

CHAPTER XII.

PRAYERS FOR THE CONVERSION OF ENGLAND.

FROM what has been said in the preceding chapters, it will be gathered that even in the thirties, before the effect of the Oxford movement had begun to make itself felt, there were already many more influential converts to Catholicism than had been the case before the passing of Emancipation. The names we have already come across—Rev. George Spencer, Frederick Lucas, Chisholm Anstey, Henry Bagshawe, Dr. Logan—were only a few of a rapidly growing class. Their accession gave rise in some instances to the highest hopes. Thus, for example, Mr. Lisle Phillipps wrote[1] in January, 1841 : "The Catholic movement at Oxford I certainly regard as the brightest symptom of England's re-conversion, but thank God it is not the only one. There is a general movement amongst the lower classes which is most consoling. Great numbers have been received into the Church all over the Midland District during this last Christmas festival. . . . At Whitwick the Rev. Mr. Whitaker received into the Church sixteen people on Christmas Day, besides a large number of others who had been received during the preceding Advent, so much so that in these three missions, that is Grace Dieu, Loughborough, and Whitwick, all three close together, no fewer than two hundred Protestants have been admitted into the Catholic Church since last October. I hear statements of a similar nature with regard to Derby, Leicester, Hinckley, Atherstone, and other places not far from us ; whilst scarcely a week passes without isolated struggling conversions taking place in the intermediate villages, which again become the focus of a new colony." Three months later he wrote still more definitely :

[1] *Life*, i., p. 107.

"Of this you may rest assured, that the reunion of the churches is certain".

These views were shared to a greater or less degree by many of the converts, and supplied a stimulating motive to help on the movement by prayer. Chief among those whose hopes ran high was the Rev. George Spencer, who initiated a regular and systematic crusade of prayer for the conversion of England. He kept his enthusiasm up to a high pitch, and by the winning influence of his personality, succeeded in carrying many along with him. In Rome the most hopeful outlook prevailed, and the Holy See showed great readiness to help him by every possible means. It will be well at this stage to acquaint ourselves with the course of events in connection with the work, which was at its height just at the time of the division of the Vicariates in England, and which led, as we shall see, to certain difficulties which had an appreciable effect on the future of English Catholicity.

The following letter will serve to give an account of the origin and early development of the movement:—[1]

"Rev. George Spencer to Bishop Baines.

"London, *November* 6, 1838.

"My dear Lord,

"I hope I shall not be doing wrong in writing to your Lordship to explain what you may have heard something about already, as it has been mentioned in the *Orthodox Journal* and also in one or two Protestant newspapers; that is, an association of prayers for the conversion of England established by Phillipps and me at Paris. Such is the matter as stated in *The Times*, and I can imagine that your Lordship might be one who on seeing it mentioned there would question the prudence of such a proceeding. Now I must not be over-anxious that nothing that I do should meet with animadversion, but I ought to respect your Lordship's judgment, and for several reasons I would wish to give you an account of what it is which has been thus publicly adverted to.

"You may have perhaps heard of Phillipps going with

[1] *Clifton Archives.* The corresponding letter, addressed to Bishop Briggs, is given in the *Life of Father Spencer*, p. 248.

Ambrose Lisle Phillipps

his family abroad for a few months. Just as he was about setting off, it was determined that I should leave home for a time on account of my health, which had failed me a little of late, and Dr. Walsh very kindly negotiated an union between Phillipps and me. We accordingly have been together in France a couple of months. Dieppe was our head-quarters; but we made an excursion for two weeks at Paris. I was presented the first evening after my arrival to the Archbishop. While in his company I was speaking, as I do very commonly, of our greatest want in England being of good prayers to assist our exertions, and I said that if France would unite in prayer for England, the benefit would be very great. The Archbishop took up the idea with an earnestness which surprised me, for I had no thought at first of proposing any settled arrangements of the kind. He was to meet seventy or eighty of the Paris clergy at St. Sulpice after two days, and appointed me to wait upon him there. When their business was concluded he presented me to them, and having mentioned what brought me there, he requested that they would undertake to pray for the conversion of England, particularly on Thursdays. I had suggested to him to make the proposal in this form, as some sort of rule seemed to be desirable, and I did not think it well to propose any settled form of prayer, as is often done on such occasions. I think I told you in one of the last letters which I had the honour of writing to you, that I had taken up a practice myself of offering my Mass every Thursday for this object, as I had also appointed Friday as the day for doing the same for my family and Phillipps and some more. I chose that day when I first became acquainted with the nuns at Mount Pavilion,[1] who keep up the perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament. They offer all their devotions and good works for this intention, but particularly on the Thursday, when as your Lordship must know, they have High Mass, Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament all day, and a solemn act of Reparation after Benediction in the evening. It appeared to me, then, that having determined to make a regular practice of saying one Mass in the week for the conversion of England, I could not do better than take that day for it, as blasphemy against

[1] Colwich.

the Holy Eucharist may be said to be the chief national sin of England in point of religion; and there could not therefore be a more appropriate devotion for the object of opening to this country the door of grace than acts of homage to the Holy Sacrament. When the Archbishop made this proposal to his clergy, the zeal with which they embraced it, as I heard afterwards of many having offered their Masses the following Thursday for England, encouraged me to go on with my object. I obtained from the Grand Vicar a circular letter to the superiors of communities in Paris, and called upon about twenty of the principal. All of them promised to unite in their prayers and to write on the subject to their sister houses throughout France. The general of the Lazarists, the Provincial of the Jesuits undertook to recommend it among their brethren; and what appeared to me of more importance, the Archbishop and Bishops whom I was able to see at Paris, promised to recommend it to the clergy and religious people of their respective dioceses and provinces, so that I could have no doubt it would soon be almost general in France. When I returned to Dieppe, I spoke of it to the Curé of St. Jacques, the principal church, who first spoke of it himself and then desired me to address the people myself, which I did the last Sunday I was there, and was delighted with the kindness with which all seemed to enter into the design.

"Now it is not becoming in me to suggest a plan to your Lordship, but yet I thought it would be right to mention what is being done in France to the Bishops of England, as I have already done to Dr. Griffiths and Dr. Walsh, whom I have seen since my return, and by letter to Dr. Briggs. I need not ask you whether you desire those under your authority to unite in the intention of these prayers, for of course you would wish that to be done; but you will have your own judgment to form whether to take upon you to mention the thing to anybody, or to notice it particularly. I determined not to take measures myself directly to give this plan publicity, but not to be surprised or sorry if it gained it without my concurrence. Accordingly I was not sorry when I heard of its being mentioned in a Protestant paper, as I think the impression may be good on Protestants themselves. Perhaps I may

be advised after a time to explain the subject publicly, but I do not intend it now. It would give me particular pleasure if Your Lordship thought it right to communicate what I have told you to your College, and to desire the members of it to correspond with the intention. I made a particular point to address myself to the Seminaries in France. But of this your Lordship must be the judge.

"I beg to conclude by subscribing myself,

"Your obedient servant,

"GEORGE SPENCER."

From his own Bishop, Dr. Walsh, Father Spencer received every encouragement and assistance. Indeed, so important did he consider it to instil into his future priests this spirit of zeal for the conversion of England that he summoned Rev. George Spencer to Oscott in 1839, and entrusted to him the spiritual direction of the students. In this capacity the latter seems to have exercised considerable influence over them, while he also continued to go about and preach so far as his new duties would allow.

His former master, Dr. Wiseman—to whom also he wrote—was equally sympathetic. He answered by a long letter, of which we may quote the more important passages.[1] He began as follows:—

"ROME, *Ash Wednesday*, 1839.

"MY DEAR FRIEND,

"I must not delay any longer answering your kind and interesting letter. Its subject is one which has long occupied my thoughts though I never contemplated the possibility of enlisting foreign churches in prayer for it, but turned my attention more to exciting a spirit of prayer amongst ourselves. I will enter on the matter in hand with the most insignificant part of it, that is my own feelings and endeavours, because I think that they may encourage you and suggest some thoughts upon the subject. In our conference this time last year, I spoke very strongly to the students upon the wants of England, and the necessity of a new system in many things. One of the points on which I insisted was the want of syste-

[1] The whole of the letter can be found in the *Life of Father Spencer*, pp. 253 *seq.*

matic prayer for the conversion of England, and at the same time of reparation for her defection. I observed that it is the only country which has persisted in and renewed in every generation formal acts of apostacy, exacting from every sovereign in the name of the nation, and from all that aspired to office or dignity, specific declarations of their holding Catholic truths to be superstitious and idolatrous. This therefore assumes the form of a national sin of blasphemy and heresy—not habitual, but actual; it is a bar to the Divine blessing, an obstacle of a positive nature to God's grace. It calls for contrary acts, as explicit and as formal to remove its bad effects. Now what are the points upon which the blasphemous repetition of national apostacy has fastened? They are chiefly Transubstantiation, and the worship of the Blessed Virgin. These, consequently, are the points towards which the reparation and for it the devotion of Catholics should be directed in England. I therefore proposed and have continued to inculcate this twofold devotion to our students on every occasion. I have for a year made it my daily prayer that I might be instrumental in bringing back devotion to the Blessed Eucharist, its daily celebration, frequent communion and public worship in England; and at the same time devotion to the Blessed Virgin, chiefly through the propagation of the Rosary. . . .

"First as to the Blessed Eucharist, my plan was different from yours in one respect, that instead of fixing on one day, I proposed to engage priests to say Mass for the conversion of England on different days, so that every day twenty or thirty Masses might be said for its conversion, and in expiation to the Blessed Sacrament. . . . In a sermon in the *Gesù e Maria* last spring, I alluded to a hope I fondly cherished, that public reparation would before long be made in England to the Blessed Sacrament, and this brought me a letter from a devout lady, earnestly begging I would try to have something done in that way, and naming persons in England most anxious to co-operate in anything of the sort. My idea was borrowed from my excellent friend Charles Weld, and consisted in *Quarant 'Ore*,[1] not confined to one town, but making the

[1] For the benefit of those not accustomed to our Catholic devotions, it may be explained that the *Quarant 'Ore*, or Forty Hours' Prayer, includes an Exposi-

circuit of all England, so that by day and night the Adorable Sacrament might be worshipped through the year. I have proposed it to Lord Shrewsbury, for I think it should commence with the Colleges, Convents, Gentlemen's chapels, and large towns, in which I trust each chapel would consent. As the Exposition at each place lasts two days, it would require 182 changes in the year, or if each would take it twice a year, 91. There are about twenty-five religious communities and colleges; the chapels in large towns could afford to make up other twenty-five. I think that many pious people would like to have the Exposition, and gladly contribute the expense, and the *giro* might be published for the year in each directory. . . .

"Secondly, as to devotion to the Blessed Virgin, I proposed the forming of Confraternities of the Rosary, and while Saturday should be the general day for the devotion, I would have different congregations fix on different days, so that each day the powerful intercession might be invoked upon us and upon our labours, and reparation be made to her for the outrages committed against her. . . ."

In the same letter Dr. Wiseman tells the origin of his own prayers for the conversion of England, which are still said daily at the English College at Rome, and two of which have found their way into the modern "Manual of Prayers," and are widely used.

"I took out of our Archives," he writes, "a printed paper, of which I enclose a copy, showing that prayers for the conversion of England, etc., have in former times occupied the attention of our College, with blessed beads, etc., for the purpose of encouraging them, and that the Holy See conferred ample spiritual privileges upon the practice. You will see how the Rosary is particularly privileged. This paper, through Giustiniani, I laid before the Congregation of Indulgences, to get them renewed for prayers for England, and was told that it would be better to draw up something new, suited to the present times, when Indulgence would be granted. . . ."

tion of the Blessed Sacrament day and night during that period. The devotion was instituted in Milan about the year 1534, and introduced into Rome by St. Philip Neri. It is very popular in Italy, from whence it has also spread to other countries.

He accordingly drew up the prayers which have since become well known. The Congregation made no difficulty about granting the Indulgences asked for, and on February 4, 1840, Dr. Wiseman wrote to Dr. Griffiths announcing this fact.

Dr. Griffiths, however, with his two colleagues Dr. Briggs and Dr. Baines, were less sympathetic with the whole movement, and in the case of the first-named at least, the fact of its emanating partly from Dr. Wiseman did not tend to make him more favourable. Dr. Griffiths in his answer only pointed out that he had already, in his pastorals of 1839 and 1840, urged his flock to pray for the conversion of England. For this want of interest shown by the Bishops it is probable that the indiscreet manner of talking on the part of some of the more enthusiastic converts themselves was in a measure to blame. They not only used harsh language against their former friends, calling them "heretics" and the like, but while exhorting them to follow by joining the Catholic Church, they did not hesitate to declare that many were on the point of doing so, and were only held back by the want of zeal among the Catholics themselves, especially among the clergy, who made no effort (they said) to effect conversions. They failed as others had done, to understand the timidity and retirement of the old Catholics, and the dry and undemonstrative nature of their piety. It was perhaps a natural result of the reaction after leaving the Anglican in favour of the Catholic Church that they longed for all the warmth of devotion they had expected to find, and they sought to remedy the defect by themselves founding new devotions and confraternities such as ordinarily thrive in Catholic countries, but were considered by the old Catholics as unsuitable to England. In particular, the converts attached an exaggerated importance to such things as the wearing of medals and scapulars; and in order to show the living nature of their belief, they put faith in many miracles and reported prophecies—usually foretelling the conversion of England or the like—and spoke of them as though they were everyday incidents, regardless of the slender evidence on which many of them rested. They looked upon the more cautious attitude of the hereditary Catholics as part of their want of zeal and called out for a regular reform. "We must

have a new race of zealous English missionaries," Lisle Phillipps wrote,[1] "such as we are now bringing up at Oscott, under the good Bishop and Pugin."

It was not indeed by any means all or even the majority of the converts who spoke in this way; but those who did spoke loudly and awakened a natural prejudice against the whole body. The hereditary Catholics resented the attitude of these fervent neophytes as exaggerated and uncalled for, and introducing divisions into their body, which could not but disturb their unity of action. False hopes (as they considered them) were being raised, doomed to eventual disappointment, while the result of the craving after tangible results might seriously interfere with the steady and self-effacing drudgery of ministering to their own people, to which the clergy had given themselves with such devotion, unseen by the great world without. And in addition to this, they saw a positive danger that this "aggressive" manner of speech and action might revive the anti-Catholic feeling, which since the granting of Emancipation, had already shown signs of renewed vitality, and bring forth agitation and even persecution. They moreover resented the implied or even expressed rebuke that they were not zealous for the conversion of their countrymen, and stoutly maintained that in this respect they did not fall short of the most active among the converts; only they wished that end to be pursued by ordinary and prudent means, and in particular they wished to avoid anything likely to arouse public opinion, or to give offence to their Protestant neighbours.

One of the most active opponents of the movement was Bishop Baines. He frankly refused to believe that there were any signs at all of the conversion of the bulk of the nation towards Catholicity in England. In order to put this to the test, in the year 1839 he had a census taken, when it appeared that in all the Western District the converts only amounted to 221—less than one-hundredth of the Catholic population. If those in the other Districts bore the same proportion, he calculated that they would number about 5000 a year in all England, so that to convert a million would take two centuries; and even if there was no leakage from the

[1] *Life*, i., p. 106.

Catholics to set-off on the other side, the conversion of the country would take many thousands of years.[1]

It should of course be borne in mind that in his calculation he did not allow for any new corporate movement such as the converts hoped for, but assumed that whatever conversions took place would be as before confined to individual instances. Such, he was persuaded, would prove to be the case. Hence he thought that for many reasons the encouragement of such chimerical hopes (as he considered them) would have a bad effect, both on the Catholics themselves and on their relations with their Protestant neighbours, and he considered that the time was singularly inopportune for Catholics to put themselves forward in this manner. We can quote his own words on this point:—[2]

"It is evident that if ever there was a time when it behoved the Catholic body to conduct themselves peaceably, and to avoid all suspicion, either of being leagued with the disaffected, or of wishing the overthrow of the national institutions, it was the present moment. The alarm which prevailed among the Anglican clergy and their friends lest Catholic Emancipation should lead to the overthrow of the Anglican Establishment afforded another motive which rendered it particularly desirable that all indelicate triumphs and public boasting should be refrained from by the Catholics, and that a quiet and conciliatory tone should be used by them in all their communications with Protestants. Unfortunately this was not the view taken of these matters by a portion of the Catholic body.

"Elated by the advantage gained by the Act of Emancipation, and misled by the rapid influx of Irish labourers, who everywhere swelled the numbers of the Catholic congregations, and rendered necessary the erection of churches of larger dimensions, they seemed to consider the Catholic cause as already triumphant—proclaimed aloud the rapid increase of the Catholic population—exaggerated beyond measure the number of the converts that were made—boasted that in a short time the Catholic religion would become dominant in England—and that the Anglican Establishment, which they

[1] For these statistics see Bishop Baines's Letter to Cardinal Fransoni, p. 13.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

assailed with every species of vulgar and opprobrious epithets, would be presently swept away.

"As an earnest that these acts and predictions were sincere, a priest of high distinction for his Protestant family connections and great personal merits, undertook, with surprising energy and perseverance, to induce the Catholic body, not only in Great Britain, but all over the Continent, to assist by public prayers in the conversion of England, which he described as an event already far advanced, and likely soon to be accomplished. Though the project was disapproved and discountenanced by three out of the four Vicars Apostolic, as likely to give unnecessary offence, and to excite erroneous impressions respecting the views of the Catholic body; and though the individual above mentioned was repeatedly urged to desist from his pious but ill-timed project, he still continued to pursue it with fresh ardour, encouraged by the approbation of many foreign Bishops, who were entirely mistaken as to facts, or wholly ignorant of the peculiar circumstances in which England was placed. The consequences were such as the Vicars Apostolic had foreseen. The English Protestants, knowing that all such public prayers, when used by the Church of England, had been ordained for political purposes, viz. to inflame the nation against the Catholics, did not doubt that the public prayers now proposed by the Catholics proceeded from similar motives."

Bishop Baines accordingly answered Rev. George Spencer that he could not permit a general custom in his District of offering Mass every Thursday for the conversion of England, and he devoted the whole of his Lenten pastoral in 1840 to explaining his views on the subject. In this pastoral he went very far, and was considered by many, even those who were in general agreement with his views, to have outstepped the bounds of moderation. As this pastoral led to lasting consequences, we must devote some space to its consideration.

The Bishop began by comparing the existing state of England as a world-wide power, strongly opposed to the Catholic religion, to the Roman Empire at the time of the first preaching of Christianity; and as St. Paul had complained of the conduct of some of the converts of that period, so he now

complained of some of those who came over from Protestantism. In their zeal and first fervour, he said that they called their former co-religionists by harsh names—heretics or the like—and at the same time showed their pride by trying to dictate to their new rulers. They took up new devotions, some of which were barely tolerated by the Church, some not even that, they were continually on the watch for supposed supernatural manifestations, such as visions or prophecies, and he cautioned them as St. Paul had cautioned his own converts against "*giving heed to foolish and old wives' fables* (1 Tim. iv.) which some of them found more attractive than the simple precepts of Christianity,"—and more of the same quality.

Turning to the question of prayers for the conversion of England, the Bishop proceeded as follows:—

"Every one has heard of the efforts that have for some time past been made to obtain the sanction of the Bishops for public prayers to be weekly offered for the conversion of England, which conversion is represented as an event so likely to occur as to justify this extraordinary measure. Could we view the event in this light, we should think it our duty to offer up our most humble and fervent prayers for its speedy accomplishment, and we should most earnestly recommend the same to all over whom we have authority. But even in this case, we should hesitate before we made a public display of our proceedings, lest we should thereby give unnecessary offence, and excite opposition to the object we wished to promote. But so far from believing the event to be probable, (we speak of a general national conversion), we consider it as morally impossible, and therefore not to be made an object of public prayer in any other sense than is intended by the Church when in her annual offices she prays that God 'would purge the world of all errors, remove sickness, dispel famine, open all prisons, loosen every bond, grant a happy return to all travellers, and a port of safety to all at sea'. In this sense we do and ought to pray for the conversion of England, always with the understanding that our prayers should be heard in the manner and at the time most consistent with the merciful but inscrutable providence of God."

In view of the fact that it was well known that Dr. Walsh had taken an opposite line with respect to the movement in

Rev. George Ignatius Spencer, C.P.

question, Dr. Baines adds a necessary apology or explanation in the following words :—

"If others, invested with the same authority as ourselves, think proper to act differently, we take it for granted that they have reasons, which we have not, for believing the object prayed for to be within the range of moral possibilities, or that they are not acquainted with the reasons which we have for believing that object to be as morally impossible as the return of the negro's skin to its antediluvian whiteness. So far, therefore, from approving this novel and extraordinary project, we disapprove it, and strictly forbid any of our clergy to offer up publicly in their churches or chapels the weekly prayers above mentioned. At the same time we earnestly exhort them to pray, as has been customary, for all spiritual and temporal blessings in favour of our country, and for the conversion of such erring souls as God, in His mercy, may be pleased so to favour, and of whom we doubt not there will be a great and continually increasing number."

He concludes his pastoral by pointing out that the most efficacious means for promoting the conversion of England is a multiplication of the clergy, and calls upon his flock to direct their charity towards subscribing more means for that end.

It is not to be wondered at that this pastoral was brought before the notice of the Roman authorities, and created something of a sensation. Within a few weeks Dr. Baines received a peremptory summons to come to Rome. He obeyed, and setting out on May 19, 1840, arrived at the Eternal City on June 9—the day after Dr. Wiseman's Consecration. A week later, on the 16th, he was received in audience by the Pope. We can quote the account of the interview written by himself :—[1]

"His Holiness received me," he writes, "in a way which manifested great displeasure against the English Vicars Apostolic, whom he had evidently been led to consider as wanting in devotion to the Holy See, and almost as factiously disposed. He spoke severely of certain letters that had been addressed to himself or Propaganda by the said Vicars

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

Apostolic, particularly of some which I had written, or of which I had been supposed to be the principal instigator. In reply I expressed my deep regret that we had had the misfortune to incur his Holiness's displeasure, but assured him that I had never heard a word from any of my colleagues which could justify me in doubting their sincere devotion and attachment to the Holy See. With regard to myself, as I had always entertained for his Holiness's elevated office the most profound veneration and respect, and for his sacred person the most respectful filial affection, I could confidently assert that if any letters or acts of mine had been understood to convey anything contrary to these feelings, they had been misinterpreted. With these assurances his Holiness seemed satisfied."

After this the Holy See proceeded with its usual deliberation and thoroughness. A series of complaints of the various expressions in the pastoral which had given offence was drawn out, and read to Bishop Baines on July 2 by Cardinal Fransoni, who requested a written reply. He did not say who had drawn them out. Dr. Baines himself, in his written account, accuses Mr. Henry Bagshawe of bringing the matter before the Roman authorities, but declares that the accusations based on the pastoral could not have been the work of an English convert, and must have been drawn up by "his enemies in Rome". From another letter it would appear that he thought that Dr. Gentili had been concerned in it, but in this he was mistaken. No doubt Dr. Gentili might have thought it incumbent on him to bring the matter before the Holy See if he had had the opportunity, but in fact he had left Rome before Dr. Baines arrived. Whoever drew the accusations up, it must be acknowledged that they were in some cases captious and even fanciful. For example, when fault is found with the concluding paragraph, asking prayers for the Queen on her recent marriage with Prince Albert, the objector comments as follows:—

"Of the Sovereign Pontiff of the Catholic Church not a word; and, therefore, the converts say that the only object of his solicitude was to obtain the favour of the Government and of the Protestants."

The complaint became the more captious from the fact

that the prayer appended in the pastoral was that ordinarily in use in England after the post-communion on Sundays, in which the Pope's name does actually occur before that of the Sovereign, and as we saw in a previous chapter, it had been criticised by his Holiness on that very account.

Nevertheless there was unfortunately sufficient matter in the Bishop's pastoral to which exception could legitimately be taken to make a strong case against the Bishop.

Dr. Baines put in his answer on August 18. The consideration of it had to be deferred till after the Vacation, when the Pope deputed eight Cardinals to act as a special congregation to consider it and report. Their decision was come to on December 9, and it was adverse to the Bishop. The Pope communicated the result to him on January 18, 1841, and laid down certain conditions with which he required him to comply under pain of being removed from his Vicariate. Dr. Baines submitted with all humility to the Pope's decision, and undertook to prepare a Declaration to disclaim the objectionable meanings which had been imputed to his words. A translation of this Declaration will be found in the Appendix.[1] Dr. Baines delivered it to the Holy Father on March 15, 1841. The Pope in return wrote him a formal letter expressing his satisfaction, and ended by giving the Bishop a present of 4,000 crowns towards his expenses. Dr. Baines accordingly returned to his diocese in the early part of the summer of 1841.

During his absence from England much had happened. The Vicariates—including his own—had been divided, and Dr. Wiseman had been installed at Oscott. It was freely said that Dr. Baines had been censured in Rome, and had narrowly escaped being deposed from his office. In these random rumours, as is usually the case, truth was mixed with falsehood, and on the whole, they held up the Bishop in an undesirable light. On his return he determined—against the advice of many of his friends—to answer them. In order to do so he printed two pamphlets. One of these he entitled "A History of the Pastoral, etc.," and though printed, it was only circulated privately. The other took the form of a published "Letter to Sir Charles Wolseley," a convert who happened to be in Rome

[1] See Appendix K.

at the time of his visit. In these he maintained that he had not been called upon to retract anything, but he had only explained his meaning, which meaning ought to have been plain enough from his words.

"These Declarations," he said, ". . . are little more than a simple explanation of certain passages in the pastoral, which the converts or their agents had interpreted in an objectionable sense. How far such interpretations could fairly be put upon my words, others must be better judges than myself. To me they appear forced and unnatural. However, being called upon by my superiors to explain my sentiments more fully upon these heads, it was my duty to suppress all feelings of repugnance, and to comply with their demands with all humility and sincerity, which I accordingly did." He further quoted the Pope as saying, "Take notice, that you have not been required to retract anything," and printed a letter from Lord Clifford corroborating this statement.

These pamphlets were much disapproved of in Rome. They had the effect of reopening the whole question, and once more it was freely said that the Bishop would be removed from his District. This extreme measure was not however taken; but the Pope sent a letter to each of the Vicars Apostolic,[1] cautioning them against accepting Bishop Baines's version of what had happened. This letter will be found in the Appendix. The following is a translation of the most important part:—

"Since, however, the Bishop of Siga, instead of responding to our clemency as he should have done, has published new pamphlets, in which he perverts almost every fact, and quoting one letter of ours, dated March 19, after he had made his Declaration, omitted other things which had happened before, and finally as if celebrating a triumph, endeavoured to persuade his own people that the Pastoral Letter in question written by him had been held to be free from the taint and suspicion of error, and not worthy of censure, we feel it due to our office that we should by no means permit such boasting and untruthfulness, from which great dishonour to the Apostolic See and the Christian Religion might arise, to prevail against the truth. Hence we have thought well to send the aforesaid

[1] *Clifton Archives.* The original Latin will be found in Appendix K.

documents to your Fraternity, as well as to your colleagues the Vicars Apostolic of England, that you may learn the whole matter, and at the same time take measures according to your wisdom to guard against all scandal, and reasonably and prudently to inform those whose ignorance of these things might be harmful."

APPENDIX TO VOLUME I.

APPENDIX A.

SCHEME FOR HIERARCHY BY BISHOP POYNTER.

THE following document, the original of which is at the English College at Rome, was apparently drawn out by Dr. Poynter during his visit there in 1815.

CONSIDERATIONS, ETC., ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF BISHOPS IN ORDINARY IN GREAT BRITAIN.

(1) BISHOPS AND PARISH PRIESTS IN ORDINARY WITHOUT PENSIONS FROM THE GOVERNMENT.

What the consequence? In towns and elsewhere where there are more than one chaplain in a chapel, one of such chaplains must be a parish priest and the others his vicars. Hence a superiority arises to the parish priest over the vicars and hence the obligation to the parish priest of abiding with his flock. Hence a disability in the Bishop in Ordinary to remove such a parish priest without a canonical fault. Quer. How will such a parish priest relish his inability to leave his flock when the means of maintaining himself with his flock will be precarious? How will the vicars relish their state of inferiority when they have nothing to look up to but the state of a parish priest under circumstances so precarious? Suppose the parish priest to commit a canonical fault, how is he to be tried? How is the Court to try him to be constituted? By what laws is such a Court to be governed? Are there any canonical laws certainly received in England competent to the formation of such a Court and to the exercise of its necessary functions? In such Court how can oaths be administered? Even supposing Papal authority warrant the administration of oaths, will the Civil Courts in England protect such warrant, and if not and the parish priest be rebellious, and

either refuse to submit to the jurisdiction of the Court or inform against it as pretending to administer oaths unlawfully, what the consequence? As to parish priests in places where one priest only is requisite, and the foundation for that priest be a nullity or very small, or aided by some Catholic nobleman or gentleman, in the two former suppositions how will such parish priest savour his obligation of continuing with his flock? And in the last supposition how will the nobleman or gentleman savour his having an irremovable priest in or near his residence? As to the presentation to parishes in town or elsewhere where no nobleman or gentleman comes in aid, is such presentation to rest solely in the Bishop in Ordinary? And in places where noblemen and gentlemen do lend an aid, is such presentation to be conjoint with the Bishop and such noblemen or gentlemen, and supposing the nobleman or gentleman to support the priest entirely, is the presentation to rest with him solely?

(2) Bishops in Ordinary and Parish Priests in Ordinary with Pensions from Government.

Supposing the Bishops in Ordinary and Parish Priests in Ordinary are pensioned by the Crown, what ought to be the amount of such pensions? It would seem that the amount from time to time might be regulated by the price of bread, and taking the present price, that each parish priest should in London be allowed for himself about the annual sum of £300 and for each of his vicars about the annual sum of £150, and that he should be allowed a vicar for every thousand persons in his Congregation after the first thousand. So that if his Congregation do not exceed one thousand he should be allowed no vicar at all except in cases of old age and infirmity—certified by the Bishop in Ordinary to Government. That in the country each parish priest should be allowed for himself £200 per annum and for each vicar £100 per annum, the number of vicars to be regulated according to the former proposal. Places of residence free from rent and taxes to be supplied to the parish priest and his vicars and in some country places some allowance for a horse.

In every case whether the Bishops in Ordinary, parish priests and vicars be pensioned or unpensioned by Government, it would seem expedient or even necessary that a code of canons should be solicited from and approved by Rome, and approved of and received in England and Scotland for the ecclesiastical Government in that island, and supposing pensions it would also seem expedient that such code of laws should be presented to Government to the end that it might have full knowledge of the same and give a civil effect

thereto. For instance, supposing a parish priest to be pensioned by Government and to commit a canonical fault and such parish priest to be censured and deposed by his Bishop, it will be essential that such censure and deposition be confirmed by the Government, otherwise the pension without the spiritual faculties would remain with the deposed priest, and to this effect and other necessary effects the cognisance in the Government of the canons and their protection of the same seem necessary. Quer. In every case whether pensioned or unpensioned, whether the parish priest or Bishop is to have the appointment of the vicars, or whether such appointment should not be conjoint? Quer. Whether the same is to be said as to the removal of vicars? Supposing pensions and the Canons to be known and supported by Government, care must be taken in the Canons that it be clearly understood that the censure or deposition of a parish priest be entirely directed by Catholic principles, the determination of which to rest solely with the Bishop, from whom there can be no appeal to Government: though there may and ought to be an appeal to a higher ecclesiastical authority. Supposing as last supposed whether it would not be feasible and prudent to solicit the insertion in the Canons of some matters relative to marriages, viz. the production of a conformity of the Canons with the laws of England respecting impediments, so that in no case any dispensation should ever be allowed between persons related by consanguinity or affinity in the first degree or the first and second mixt, and that in all cases under the first degree and the first and second mixt, no dispensation should hereafter be required. It would seem that such a regulation would simplify and satisfy and entail no prejudicial or noxious effect. Quer. In case of Bishops in Ordinary what titles should they have? Should there be more Bishops in Ordinary than there are Vicars Apostolic at present? And whether there should be one or more Archbishop? On this point it appears essential that the Bishops in England and in Scotland should be totally free of the Irish hierarchy. The prudence of even submitting the Scottish Bishops to an English Metropolitan seems to be a matter of very great doubt. It would seem highly advisable that the same Canons should be common both to England and Scotland, hence care must be taken that such Canons do not clash with but be made conformable as far as the nature of the case will admit to both the Scottish and English laws. In case of pensions, quer. their amount as to Archbishops and Bishops? It would appear reasonable that a Bishop should have at least double and an Archbishop at least treble the pension of a parish priest in London. If a Bishop had even £1,000 a year and an Archbishop £1,200 or £1,500 a year the extravagance

would not be notorious, for hospitality is a virtue, and the means of the liberal exercise of a virtue are not to be despised. But it would be well that in the grant of pensions to Bishops the view of their exercising hospitality should be expressed on the face of the grant, as such expression would be highly satisfactory to the public as well Catholic as Protestant. No Archbishop or Bishop to be allowed in any case to be at the same time a parish priest or to have any claim directly or indirectly upon any pension of any parish priest or vicar, and that no parish priest should have pensions of any two parishes, all pluralities to be strictly guarded against. In cases of pensions to parish priests, whether the Government should have anything like a veto as to their appointment. If possible surely such appointment had better rest solely with the Bishop, he simply notifying to Government that he had appointed such a man to such a place. It would seem there could be no objection for the Bishop to take an oath that he never would appoint a man to a parish of whose loyalty he had any suspicion, but if Government should insist on knowing who are the persons whom the Bishop intends to appoint to any parishes, the Bishop in that case must notify to Government that he intends to appoint such a man to such a place and that he has no suspicion with regard to his loyalty. If after such notification the Government should say to the Bishop you have no suspicion but we have, the grounds of such declaration should be laid before the Bishop, and if he perceives them to be solid he surely ought not to appoint such a man, but if he perceives them to be weak or false, he should have the power notwithstanding, otherwise it would seem that Government would be head of the Church. In such cases the Bishop must insist on the appointment though Government should insist on refusing the pension, so that the Church authority should be entire though the priest be poor.

Supposing the Archbishops or Bishops to be pensioned, if the Government do not like them they may refuse them the pensions, this before they are appointed. But if the pensions being refused they are still appointed by ecclesiastical authority, it would seem that they ought to be allowed to exercise their functions unpensioned and unmolested, except they do that which would make any other subject of his Majesty liable to molestation. Absit the power of sending a British subject out of the country for exercising ecclesiastical functions without the royal fiat, and equally absit the power of preventing priests from exercising parochial faculties without the royal fiat. The withholding of pensions from such persons whether Bishops or priests of whose appointment they do not approve should terminate the power of Government with regard to the appointment of Bishops and

priests. It will ever be the duty and interest of the Holy See and of the Bishops not to appoint or concur in the appointment of persons disloyal or reasonably suspected of disloyalty, but if Government will suspect without reason let their vigilance not their power of rejection be proportionate to their suspicions. Quer. Whether Bishops in Ordinary must of necessity have Deans and Chapters? This to be considered.

APPENDIX B.

BISHOP BAINES AND THE BENEDICTINES.

(1) Apology to Bishop Baines for his Exclusion from the Benedictine Chapter of 1826. Signed by the Provincial and ten other Leading Members of the English Benedictine Congregation.[1]

We, the undersigned Benedictines, regretting the illustrious Coadjutor of the Western District has not been able to assist in our deliberations at this Chapter by his counsels, cannot return home without taking an opportunity of expressing our admiration at his great talents, which have been so powerfully exerted in favour of religion, our esteem for his public and private virtues, which must endear him to every good man, and our firm conviction that it always was and still is his sincerest desire to promote the interests of the Benedictine family on which he once conferred honour by his being a member of it.

We therefore humbly entreat him to accept this expression of our sentiments, to which we also add our most fervent prayers that the Almighty would speedily restore him to perfect health, and prolong a life so dear and valuable to all the best interests of Religion.

Thomas Robinson, *Provincial.*
Edward B. Glover, *Definitor of the Regimen.*
John Turner, *Cathedral Prior.*
James Bede Burgess, *Cathedral Prior.*
John Robinson, *Cathedral Prior.*
Thomas Fisher, *Definitor of the Regimen.*
Thomas Burgess, *Prior Conventus.*
Richard Towers, *Definitor of England.*
Thomas Brindle, *Missionary at Bath.*
Thomas Rooker, *Professor of Philosophy at Ampleforth.*
Ralph Cooper, *Missionary at Bath.*

Bathampton, *July 23rd*, 1826.

[1] *Archives of the English College, Rome.*

(2) Similar Apology from the Monks of Ampleforth.[1]

We, the undersigned Benedictine monks of St. Lawrence's [Ampleforth], cannot pass over this day of our holy Patron without expressing our most sincere regret that the illustrious Coadjutor of the Western District was not invited to assist the members of the late Chapter by his advice and talents.

We take this opportunity of expressing our admiration at his great abilities, which have been so powerfully exerted in favour of Religion; our esteem for his public and private virtues, which must endear him to every good man, and our firm conviction that it always was, and is still, his sincerest desire to promote the interest of the Benedictine Family in general, but in particular that of Ampleforth, which once had the honour of calling him a son, but now looks up to him as a father.

Gratitude shall cease to be a virtue ere the remembrance of his kindness shall be blotted from our hearts. We therefore humbly entreat him to accept the expression of our sentiments, to which we add our most fervent prayers that the Almighty would speedily restore him to perfect health, and prolong a life so dear and valuable not only to those who have been fostered under its care, but to all the best interests of Religion.

(Signed by all the Superiors and Religious of the Monastery.)

St. Lawrence's, Ampleforth,
August 10, 1826.

(3) Letter from Cardinal Capellari, Prefect of Propaganda, to the Prior and Monks of Downside, dated July 28, 1829.[2]

Compertum mihi est querelas et dissidia vos inter et Episcopum Siganum Reverendissimum Baynes Vicarium Apostolicum existere, dissidiorum causas in quibusdam juribus positas esse ac privilegiis quibus vos gaudere et ab ejus dependentia emancipari contenditis.

Quanto id dolore me afficiat vix verbis explicare possum, quippe qui probe intelligam maximum inde detrimentum atque jacturam Catholicae isthic Religioni ac Ecclesiae obvenire. Dissidentibus enim vobis, et a Vicario Apostolico abalienatis, cum tanta sit in isto Districtu Sacrorum Operariorum inopia, qui reliqui erunt Sacerdotes per quos ager iste Dominicus excolatur?

Quapropter ne muneri quo fungor Praefecti Sac. hujus Congregationis de Propaganda Fide deesse videar, eaque necessitudine motus,

[1] *Ibid.*

[2] This and the following letters are taken from the *Documenti* printed in Rome in 1830.

quae mihi ob monasticam sub eodem Ssmo Patriarcha Benedicto vobiscum est, has ad vos litteras mittere statui : non quidem, ut hic de existentia, qualitate, extensione ac usu assertorum jurium, aut privilegiorum examen instituere, judicisque partes agere velim, sed ut meum vobis aperiam amicum animum, simul et vivum patefaciam desiderium, ne hujusmodi examini judicioque locus detur utque omnia pacifice ac benevole componantur. Mediatoris igitur tantum ac hortatoris officium nunc exequor, ea utique spe fretus ut faciles mihi aures praebituri sitis.

Itaque ad rem veniamus. Reverendissimus Vicarius Apostolicus Confrater et consodalis vester, vos ex corde diligit, ingenueque vos colit. Quia vero in isto cui ipse praeest Districtu vestrum extat Monasterium, ideo et vestra exoptat ac petit adjuvari opera in ejusdem Districtus Missionibus administrandis, quin Missiones ipsas amittere, vobisque pleno jure in proprietatem eas cedere teneatur ; moderate autem conqueritur de vestra in hac parte indocilitate ac praetensionibus, qui proprio posthabito, in alieni potius Districtus Missionibus elaboratis. Hoc praeterea cordi illi est ac esse debet ut proprium Clericorum Districtus servitio addicendorum, Seminarium erigere, ac substentare ipse possit ; ast dolet quod vestrum istud Collegium, utpote recipiendis, erudiendis ac educandis juvenibus etiam saecularibus nimis patens et apertum, impedimento ei sit quominus id assequatur. Quaerit propterea ut Collegium ipsum intra eos limites, eoque modo ordinetur, qui Seminarii Episcopalis institutioni non noceant.

Quae Vicarii Apostolici petitiones ac vota, sinite me ex intimo sensu loqui, aequissima mihi videntur, ideo vobis suadeo, imo et vos oro obtestorque, ut eis obsecundare omni quo potestis studio curetis. Meum autem non est vobis praescribere quomodo tractanda, et quo deducenda sit res, quidque faciendum. Id enim consilii capiendum per vos erit, cum ipso Episcopo.

Interim monendos vos censeo dissidiis tollendis Religionisque bono istis in missionibus promovendo opportunissimum fore, atque hinc Sac. huic Congregationi gratissimum, si in posterum antequam in alienum Sacro Missionum Ministerio functuri vos conferatis, proprii Districtus necessitatibus sub Vicarii Apostolici dependentia occurrere, ac providere curabitis ; id enim suadere debetur caritas, quae ad domesticos prius se vertit quam ad extraneos.

Agite ergo religiosissimi Patres, ad pacem animos vestros componite, atque debitam Vicario Apostolico observantiam exhibentes, unanimi cum illo sententia in ista excolenda Domini vinea impigre adlaborate. Grave enim mihi esset ac valde molestum rem integram etiam quoad dissidiorum causas et originem ad Sacram Con-

gregationem deferre juridice disentiendam ac definiendam. Verum de vestra pietate ac docilitate confisus, spero id nunquam futurum.

Atque in expectatione optatissimi nuntii initae concordiae vestris me orationibus commendans, fausta cuncta a Deo bonorum omnium largitore, tota animi effusione precor.

(4) Letter from Cardinal Capellari to the President-General of the Anglo-Benedictine Congregation, dated August 12, 1829.

Quamvis de re odiosa ac molesta tractantes, pergratae nihilominus mihi fuerunt literae Paternitatis tuae diei 18 elapsi mensis Junii; quippe mihi occasionem praebent meam tibi significandi tum erga te, tum erga Congregationem istam Anglo-Benedictinam, cui tanta cum laude praees, existimationem. Non opus est autem ut longa hic responsione Paternitatem tuam detineam. Monachi enim Monasterii S. Gregorii, ad quos fusius scripsi, omnia tibi, ut par est, communicabunt.

Id unum est quod praeterire non debeo, te scilicet certiorem reddere, ne dum de amico Illmi. ac Revmi. Episcopi Baynes erga dictum Monasterium animo, verum et de peculiari ejus erga te observantia ac dilectione; nam pluries egregias quibus ornaris dotes virtutesque, scientiam, prudentiam, etc., eum ex corde celebrantem audivi.

Caeterum ex meis ad Monachos litteris, Paternitas tua inferre facile poterit, quantum utriusque partis pro bono religionis intersit de juribus non contendere, sed rem adducere ad concordiam. Hoc autem non admodum difficile censeo et spero, praesertim Te mediatore, futurum. Quare benevole accipias, quaeso praesens quod Tecum exequor officium, Te scilicet enixe orans et obtestans, ut quo Te Monachi prosequuntur amore et obsequio, necnon et Tui muneris auctoritate uti velis ad hujusmodi curandam firmandamque concordiae conciliationem.

Quod si graves in re pertractanda difficultates emergent, quominus ad optatum exitum perducatur, eas mihi, si opus fuerit, denuntiare ne omittas; nihil enim intentatum relinquam ut omnia pacifice componantur. Interim me Tibi tota animi effusione offero.

(5) Answer of the Prior and Monks of Downside, Addressed to Cardinal Capellari, dated October 25, 1829.

RMe et EMe Cardinalis

Mirifice nos recrearunt Eminentiae tuae literae Romae datae sub die octava Augusti, quibus declaratur quanto Paternitatis affectu reliquias hujus nostrae celeberrimae quondam Congregationis Anglo-

Benedictinae tua foveat Amplitudo. Diu scilicet a Tempestatibus olim jactatae, atque in ipso, ut sperabamus, Portu inopinatam perspicienti advenientem procellam, amicum sidus Tua benevolentiae professio affulget.

Fidem imprimis apud tuam Eminentiam habeat protestatio haec, summae nostrae a Sede Apostolica dependentiae, unde tanta ac talia, quibuscunque gloriamur, privilegia et beneficia derivantur. Neque etiam timendi locus est ne illa nobis detrahantur, quamdiu nullum nostrum probetur demeritum, nulla Regularis disciplinae inobservantia, mutatio in Congregationis regimine aut in fine principaliter a resuscitata Congregatione proposito (Missionibus scilicet in tota Anglia fungendis) nulla a quo tempore hujusmodi Privilegia collata, confirmata ac praeservata fuere. Atqui rem ita se habere Tuae Eminentiae probaturos confidimus, si minus Epistolis quae omnia complecti omnia explicare difficile valeant, viva saltem voce et in ipso Apostolorum limine. Statuimus enim unum aut alterum nostrae Congregationis Monachum Sacerdotem ad urbem sine mora, quamvis non sine magno incommodo, deputandum, qui Eminentiae tuae quoad omnia satisfacere queat. Interim fas sit repellere insinuationes undecunque exortas, jurgia et dissidia extitisse circa privilegia nostrum inter Monasterium et Revmum. Episcopum Siganum. Ex conscientia siquidem protestamur nullum omnino habuisse nos cum eodem Revmo. jurgium sive dissensionem, neque cum venerando ejusdem praedecessore, quocum arctiori unionis vinculo conjuncti semper eramus.

Haec breviter impraesentiarum, ut tuae consulatur Amplitudini tot tantisque solicitudinum molibus gravatae, perstringimus; quae fusius et clarius brevi, ut speramus, explicabuntur. Fidentes vero tuam Eminentiam obsecramus, ne magnificum opus et venerandum, quale est illud Congregationis nostrae Anglo-Benedictinae, quae per tot saecula duravit, compagibus resolutis erutove fundamento in terram projiciatur, unde restituere conabitur frustra.

Perpetuam precantes salutem, sumus Eminentiae tuae

Devmi et obsmi servi

F. L. Barber, *Prior.*
F. Beda Polding, *Sub-prior. et Phil. Prof.*
F. Jos. Brown, *S.S. Prof. et Jun. Mag.*
F. Paulin. Heptonstall, *Sac. et Nov. Mag.*
F. Bern. Hort, *Proc. Sac.*
F. Rad Pratt, *Sac. Prof. Jur.*
F. Dunst. Scott, *Proc. in Curia Londinensi.*
F. Beda Rigby, *Sac.*
F. B. Ullathorne, *Subd.*

F. N. KENDAL, *Subd.*
F. A. DOWDING, *Subd.*
F. B. SPENCER.
F. F. R. DAVIS, *Subd.*
F. O. SINNOT, *Subd.*
F. V. DOWDING, *Nov.*

DOWNSIDE COLLEGE,
Octobris 25, 1829.

(6) LEGAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE THREE SECULARISED SUPERIORS OF AMPLEFORTH AND THE AUTHORITIES OF THE ENGLISH BENEDICTINE CONGREGATION, HANDING OVER THE PROPERTY WHICH THEY HAD HELD IN TRUST.[1]

The agreement made this 13th day of May 1830 between the Rev. Thomas Burgess, the Rev. Thomas Rooker and the Rev. Edward Metcalfe, all of Ampleforth in the County of York, of the one part, and the Rev. Edward Glover of Little Crosby in the County of Lancaster, the Rev. Samuel Day of Clayton Green of the said County of Lancaster, the Rev. Henry Brewer of Brownedge in the said County of Lancaster, and the Rev. Ralph Cooper of the City of Bath of the other part, as follows, that is to say, the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe do hereby jointly and severally promise and agree to and with the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper that they the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe and each of them shall and will upon the request and at the costs and charges of the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper, or the survivors or survivor of them, or their heirs, executors or administrators of each survivor execute all such Acts, Deeds, Conveyances, Assignments, Surrenders, Letters of Attorney and Assurances in the Law as the Counsel of the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper or the survivors or survivor of them or the heirs, executors or administrators of such survivor shall advise or require for conveying, assigning and transferring unto the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper their heirs, executors, administrators and assigns as joint tenants according to the nature or quality thereof respectively, subject only to such mortgage or other encumbrances as now affect the same, all the Messuages, Lands, Tenements and Hereditaments of or to which they the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe or [any] or either of them now are or is seized, possessed or entitled, situate at Craike in the County of Durham

[1] See Mgr. Shepherd's *Reminiscences of Prior Park*, p. 131.

Byland, Ampleforth and Oswaldkirk in the County of York, Orrell-post in the parish of Wigan in the County of Lancaster and Workington in the County of Cumberland or elsewhere in which the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper or any of them are interested, together with all Deeds, Evidences and writings relating thereunto and also all Household goods, Furniture and Implements of Household and all Farming Stock and Cattle in and upon the said Messuages, Lands, Tenements and Hereditaments (except the Cattle mentioned in the schedule hereunder written which belong to the said Edward Metcalfe exclusively and are intended and agreed to be retained by him) and also all monies secured on mortgage or invested in the funds or upon government or other securities in the names of the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker, Edward Metcalfe or any or either of them (other than such monies if any as may have been invested in their or any of their names as a trustee or trustees and in which the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper are not beneficially interested). And further that until such Acts, Deeds, Assignments and Assurances as aforesaid shall be made and executed they the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe their respective heirs, executors and administrators shall and will stand and be seized and possessed of all the said premises IN TRUST for the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper their heirs, executors, administrators, and assigns as joint tenants. And for the Considerations aforesaid the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper do hereby jointly and severally promise to and with the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe that they the said Edward Glover, Samuel Day, Henry Brewer and Ralph Cooper or some or one of them shall and will pay and discharge all the sums of money now due and owing by the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe, or any or either of them which are mentioned and specified in an account stated between the several parties hereto and this day signed by all of them and marked with the letter *A* and also such other sums of money if any as are now due and owing by the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe or any or either of them in managing the affairs of Ampleforth College and shall and will protect and indemnify the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker and Edward Metcalfe and each of them against all actions, suits, claims and demands on account thereof. And likewise shall and will upon or previously to the Execution of such Conveyances and Assignments as aforesaid effectually indemnify the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas

Rooker and Edward Metcalfe and each of them their respective heirs, executors and administrators against the payment of the Mortgage-debt and other Incumbrances affecting the Messuages and other Hereditaments herein before mentioned or any part thereof and against all Actions, Suits, Claims and Demands on account of the same, witness our Hands and signed by the said Thomas Burgess, Thomas Rooker, Edward Metcalfe, Edward Glover and Samuel Day in the presence of John Birdsall. Signed by the said Henry Brewer in the presence of Edward Clifford. Signed by the said Ralph Cooper in the presence of Joseph Spencer.

(7) Attempted Mediation of Dr. Wiseman.

The following are the conditions of compromise between Bishop Baines and President Birdsall proposed by Dr. Wiseman at Cheltenham on November 19, 1832. They were accepted by Bishop Baines, but refused by President Birdsall.

Proposals for the Settlement of the Differences between the Rt. Rev. Dr. Baines and the Very Rev. Mr. Birdsall, President of the Benedictines.

The differences at present existing arise from conflicting claims regarding

1. The winding up of Dr. Collingridge's Executorship.

2. The property supposed to have been abstracted from Ampleforth and transferred to Prior Park.

(*a*) Dr. Baines demands the settlement of the first, to which Mr. Birdsall objects that Dr. Baines has got into his possession the Taunton ground rents, which to the amount of £3000 form the Peculium of Dr. Collingridge, and this by having induced the trustees to sign them over.

(*b*) He also demands the payment of £1000 lent by Dr. Collingridge to Mr. Birdsall, with interest, etc. To this Mr. Birdsall objects on the ground that by giving up this sum he deprives himself of a means of satisfaction for the Ampleforth claims.

It might be observed that the two accounts are totally independent of each other, the one being between the Executor of Dr. Collingridge and the District, as the monies left by will have to be applied to this, and the other litigation between Ampleforth, or the Benedictine Congregation, and Dr. Baines, or some of the members who have left them.

However, to come to some accommodation, the following bases are proposed :—

1. Dr. Baines will re-invest the sums belonging to the Executorship in the names in which they before stood.

2. Whereas £1000 of them have been appropriated, the £1000 in Mr. Birdsall's hands shall balance the same invested as above.

3. Mr. Birdsall and an agent appointed by Dr. Baines shall proceed to liquidate all mutual claims, and wind up Dr. Collingridge's affairs. A reference for differences to be chosen by the two parties, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Bramston, whose award shall be final.

4. A full, fair, and impartial discussion of the Ampleforth claims shall be made on amicable terms before any person agreed upon in concert with the Congregation of Propaganda. Dr. Baines and the parties accused will give any sort of security required that all sums and property proved to have been carried off unlawfully, or to have been wrongfully invested at Prior Park, or to exist there or elsewhere, shall be paid back, or just indemnity given.

N. WISEMAN.

CHELTENHAM, *Nov.* 19, 1832.

APPENDIX C.

PROPOSED RE-DIVISION OF THE "DISTRICTS" IN ENGLAND, WITHOUT CHANGING THEIR NUMBER, AT THE SUGGESTION OF BISHOP BAINES.[1]

(1) Letter of Bishop Baines to Cardinal Capellari.

Emme et Revme Dñe

Quo tempore constituti sunt quatuor Vicarii Apostolici (circa an. 1686) ad regimen Catholiciae Ecclesiae in Anglia, tota Anglia in tot Districtus divisa est qui quidem tunc temporis non quidem regionis extensione, sed etiam Catholicorum numero fere aequales habebantur. Singulis autem Districtibus a rege Jacobo II. pensiones assignatae sunt, quae ipso ex Anglia expulso, solvi cessarunt, et exinde tam ipsi Vicarii Apostolici quam clerus ipsis subditus voluntariis fidelium oblationibus seu eleemosynis sustentati sunt.

Mediante autem ultimo saeculo, commercium et manufacturae in aliquibus Angliae provinciis adeo mirum in modum excreverunt, totque familiae nobiles in aliis a fide defecerunt, ut jam antiqua Districtuum ratio omnino mutata sit, hodieque fere sic se habeat :—

Districtus Septentrionalis continet	.	200,000	Catholicos.
„ Meritionalis, seu Londinensis		200,000	„
„ Medius fere . . .		100,000	„
„ Occidentalis vero ad . .		10,000	„
vel ad plus		12,000	redactus est.

Haec decem vel duodecim millia Catholicorum inter duos ad minus milliones Acatholicorum, et per regionem 300 millia passuum longam et plus quam 100 millia passuum latam sparsa sunt. A quinquaginta fere missionariis ipsis inservitur, quos ex quacunque natione, prout necessitas postulat, colligit Episcopus Anglos, Hibernos, Gallos, qui nonnunquam gregis sui linguam ignorant. Hinc nedum crescit, immo in pluribus locis Districtus Occidentalis continuo

[1] The first document below is among the Clifton Archives. The only copy of the rest of the correspondence which I have met with is at Bishop's House, Leeds.

decrescit Religio Catholica. Et quis mirum, cum in toto principatu Walliae (*paese di Galles*) quae ad minus 500,000 incolarum continet, unus tantum sacerdos sit qui eorum linguam loqui possit, isque infirma admodum valetudine laborans!

Nec ulla spes emendationis effulget manente praesente Districtuum divisione. Impossibile enim est, semperque erit, ut decem millia Catholicorum, maxima ex parte pauperum, quinquaginta sacerdotes et Vicarium Apostolicum pro suis necessitatibus sustentent, nedum aliis auxilium subministrent.

Huic Vicarius Apostolicus nuper defunctus, qui certe vir sanctus et zelo religionis plenus erat, spe frustratus et infortuniis fractus, ad monasterium monialium in remoto Districtus angulo situm, se recepit, ubi omnibus fere inaccessibilis et ignotus latebat. Cum vero conscientiae vel necessitatis augustiae eum nonnunquam ingredi coegerunt, aliquas vastissimi Districtus missiones visitaturus, (totum enim Districtum nunquam visitavit), in summitate vecturae publicae (*sur l'imperial d'une Diligence*), solus sine clerico, sine famulo, sua ipsa pontificalia in saculo portans venerabilis senex iter agebat, infidelibus ludibrium, fidelibus autem ruborem excitans. Quanta ex hoc rerum statu religioni mala enascantur, inutile est enarrare.

Interim caeteri Districtus numerosiori grege potiti, seminaria ampla maximis impensis erigere, clerum nativum educare, missionum numerum quotannis augere, et conversiones innumerabiles quotidie facere valeret; denique apud ipsos religio floret et crescit.

Quae cum ista sint Emmãe vestrae, pro magno quem habetis Religionis zelo, proponere audeo, ut limitibus Districtuum aliquantulum mutatis, augeatur pro Districtu Occidentali Catholicorum numerus, imminuta, si ita placeat, ejusdem extensione. Hoc facile fieri potest, nulla injuria caeteris Districtibus inflicta. Exempli gratia, Districtus Septentrionalis plusquam 200,000 Catholicorum continet, maximum seminarium et centum octoginta missiones ex parte ditissimos. Quis non videat plures hos esse quam ab uno episcopo, in regione adeo extensa, visitentur, componantur et gubernentur? Quid mali tanto Districtui fieret si ipsi quinta vel sexta pars populi subtraheretur?

Ipsa civitas Londini plures Catholicos intra moenia continet quam Roma, et insuper habet diversas provincias annexas, plus quam centum millia passuum ab urbe distantes. Quis tanto gregi pascendo par est? Quid huic Districtui mali fieret si quaedam longinqua provincia ab ipso disjungeretur?

Instanter igitur Eminentiam Vestram imploro ut Dei et Religionis amore hanc mihi gratiam procuretis, ut aliqua mutatio in Districtuum limitibus fiat. Scribatur, si ita placeat, ex parte Sanctitatis suae, vel S. Congregationis, (nihil enim per vim aut per dolum

fieri desidero) ad caeteros Vicarios Apostolicos, ipsisque summopere suadeatur ut, collatis inter se consiliis, ipsi de quibusdam novis limitibus inter se conveniant, eo fine ut Districtus Occidentalis ad qualemcumque cum caeteris aequalitatem accedat.

Certissimus sum Religioni hoc plurimum profuturum; puto non injustum esse quod peto; certe non propriae commoditatis, sed animarum studio me animatum sentio. Laborare, abstinere, pati, valetudinem perdere, sicut quondam feci, possum et paratus sum; nihil enim horum vereor; sed cui bono? Elapsis quinquaginta amplius annis, Districtus Occidentalis invenietur aut parum profecisse aut forte in pejus ruisse. Facta autem mutatione quam instanter peto, quaeque te volente et suadente facillime fiet, et paucos post annos memoria tua a millibus millium aliter perdendorum benedicetur.

Chartam Angliam Geographicam[1] adjungo statum hodiernum quatuor Districtuum accurate describentem, ex qua cuiquam diligenter inspicienti patebit, quam vera esse quae narravi, quam facilia factu quae peto.

Quare, etc.

(2) Letter of Cardinal Capellari, Prefect of Propaganda, to the Vicars Apostolic.

Illme ac Revme Domine

Revertens in Angliam R.P.D. Petrus Augustinus Baines, Episcopus Siganus, Districtus Angliae Occidentalis Vicarius Apostolicus, cum Amplitudine Tua caeterisque RR. PP. DD. Vicariis Apostolicis Collegis tuis acturus est, ut collatis simul consiliis, statuatur qua ratione limites Districtuum Ecclesiasticorum mutari possint, atque ita dividi ut Districtus Occidentalis quoque aequalitatem aliquam cum reliquis districtibus habeat.

Memoratum igitur Episcopum Amplitudini tuae etiam atque etiam commendandum censui, certo affirmans rem gratissimam te mihi et Sacrae Congregationi esse facturum, si dederis operam ut rationum momentis quae ille adducit ad mutationis hujus necessitatem demonstrandam, mature in Domino perpensis, negotium hoc pro majori Ecclesiae bono feliciter concorditerque absolvatur.

Sacra Congregatio autem jure confidit SSmum Dñum nostrum facile probaturum esse ea quae vos ad Districtuum limites utiliter mutandas communi suffragio statuenda esse referetis.

[1] The map here alluded to can be found reproduced in the present volume, p. 26.

Precor Deum interea ut Amplitudinem tuam diu sospitem ac felicem servet.

Amplitudinis tuae

Uti Frater studiosissimus

D. M. Card. Capellari, *Praefs.*

Castruccinus Castracane, Secrius

Romae, ex aed. Sac. Congñis de Pñda Fide die 23 Maii 1829.

R.P.D. Jacobo Bramston

Episcopo Usulano

Vicario Apostolico Districtus Londinensis

Londinum.

(A similar letter was sent to each of the other Vicars Apostolic.)

(3) Answer of the Vicars Apostolic.

Emẽ et Revmẽ Domine

Epistola quam Eminentia vestra nobis dedit die 28 (*sic*) Maii praesentis anni non pervenit ad nos nisi labente mense Septembri reduce feliciter in patriam Illmo. ac Revmo. Dño Baines, Epõ Sigano, Collega nostro, et Districtus Occidentalis Angliae Vicario Apostolico. In hac Epistola Emña Vrã certiores nos facit de eo quod incertus quidam rumor ad aures nostros pertulerat, praefatum scilicet Collegam nostrum vobiscum acturum esse ut collatis simul consiliis, statuatur qua ratione limites Districtuum ecclesiasticorum mutari possint, atque ita dividi ut Districtus Occidentalis quoque aliquam cum caeteris Districtibus aequalitatem habeat.

Nos igitur reliqui in Anglia Vicarii Apostolici nostrique Coadjutores, morem gerentes Vrãe Emãe hortati nos ut auditis rationum momentis quae praedictus Epũs Siganus adduceat ad mutationis hujus necessitatem demonstrandam, ea collatis simul consiliis consideraremus; propterea sine mora, etiam hoc hiemali tempore, convenimus apud opidum Wolverhampton, in Districtu Medio, die 18 Novembris, ibique dies decem simul mansimus. Revñum Episcopum Siganum saepe de hac re copiose disserentem attente audivimus.

Cum illo deploramus statum Districtus Occidentalis, qui in partibus praesertim Walliae, fere incultus jacet; nec deerit vel nostrum consilium, vel nostra opera, quantum aes et circumstantiae sinunt, ut ejus Districtus sicut caeteri floreat. At universa re penitus et summa diligentia perpensa, non censemus mutationem geographicam Districtuum huic tanto bono inservire posse; sed potius plurimum obfuturam. Mutatio enim limitum, dato acceptoque utrimque territorio, magnopere turbaret caeteros Districtus, qui singuli habent suum Seminarium, suas proprias fundationes et legata pia, suum proprium clerum magnis impensis educatum, et juramento obligatum ad perpetuo inserviendum sacris missionibus intra limites Districtuum praesentium, ut ab Innocentio Papa XI annis abhinc 141 fuerunt

constituti, et a Benedicto Papa XIV solemniter confirmati; jurgibus et litibus viam sterneret; nec, consentibus etiam nobis, videtur vel clerus vel populus tali innovationi facile consensurus. Ex illa igitur pacis perturbatio non fidei incrementum.

Porro ideo praecipue optat Epūs Siganus ut numerus fidelium auferatur a caeteris Districtibus et aggregetur suo, ad faciendam aliquam ut dicit aequalitatem, qua persuasum habet, se sic collecturum quaestibus ingentem pecuniae vim, omnibus sui novi Districtus necessitatibus satisfacturam. Vana delusio! Nos qui diu novimus ingenium populi nobis commissi, valde vereremur ne paulatim deficeret etiam ille fons qui etiamnunc multas missionum stationes et plurimas scholas nutrit; brevique tempore auctoritatem et dignitatem praesulis insanae petulentiae et contumaciae vulgi exponeret. Deinde quomodo possit quivis alius Vicarius Aplicūs melius prospicere terrae Walliae, quam Occidentalis, qui illi territorio propior caeteris est? In nostris etiam Districtibus sane non omnis pars aequali cultura gaudet: sed sensim et pedetentim progredimur ut partes modo incultae paulatim colantur. Qui mutat limites Districtus Occidentalis parum aut nihil facit. Instituendum potius Seminarium, nostra sententia, missionum stationes paulatim formandae, colenda pax cum Religiosis Regularibus, et exemplum reliquorum Districtuum tandem aliquando ab Occidentali imitandum.

De aliis rebus de quibus in nostro consessu diliberavimus scribemus brevi ad S. Congregationem. Interea precamur Deum ut conservetur pax Christi, et ut dilecta nostra missio Anglicana magis magisque floreat,

Cum omni officii et obsequii sensu sumus

Emãe Vrãe Rm̃ae

Humillimi et obedientissimi servi

+ Thomas Smith, *Epūs Bolinensis, Vic. Aplicūs in Districtu Septentrionali Angliae.*

+ Jac. Bramston, *Epūs Usulensis, et in Districtu Londinensi Vic. Aplicūs.*

+ Thomas Walsh, *Epūs Cambysopolitanus, et in Districtu Medio Vicūs Aplicūs.*

+ Thomas Penswick, *Epūs Europiensis, et in Districtu Septent. Coadjutor.*

+ Robertus Gradwell, *Epūs Lyddensis, et in Districtu Londinen. Coadjutor.*

APPENDIX D.

THE ST. JOHN'S WOOD CHURCH.

(1) Letter from Cardinal Pedecini, Prefect of Propaganda, to Bishop Bramston.[1]

Illme et Rme Domine,

Ubi primum Sacra Congregatio accepit, pauperum praesertim commoditati opportunum templum Londini aedificari, magnopere gratulata est. Certior deinde eadem Sacra Congregatio facta fuit, illud templum in ea Londini parte, quae St. John's Wood appellatur, ferme absolutum esse. A. T. igitur (cui nota est Sac. Congñis sollicitudo, ut fidelium utilitati consulatur, maxime eorum qui conditione pauperes caritatis adjumento magis indigent) intelligit ejusmodi nuntium vere pergratum S. C. accidisse. Magnopere vero commendavit piissimarum mulierum sororum Gallini Religionis amorem et Dei gloriae amplificandae studium, quae templum illud propriis sumptibus aedificandum curarunt.

Illud nunc maxime gratum eidem S. C. contingeret, si templum hoc quamprimum aperiatur et in fidelium commodum patere incipiat. Scit Sac. Congregatio, memoratas sorores Dominas Gallini propositum habere, ut templum, de quo agitur, PP. Societatis Jesu tradatur: id autem valde utile futurum esse manifestum est. Neque enim dubium aliquod esse potest PP. Societatis Jesu omnem operam daturos esse, ut Sacri ministerii officia ibi cum animarum fructu et Religionis incremento exerceantur. Relatum vero est S. C., A. T. rogatam ut assentiatur sororibus Dominis Gallini ut copiam faciat ut templum PP. Jesuitis concedatur, et servatis servandis aperiatur, hactenus responsum non dedisse. Certum tamen habet S. C., A. T. nihil aliud prae oculis habentem nisi Ecclesiae amplificationem et fidelium utilitatem, omne dubium ea de re, si quod habet, esse depositurum et petitum consensum esse daturam. Erit certe id Sacr.

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

Congni. jucundissimum et precor Deum ut Amplitudinem Tuam diu sospitem et felicem servet.

Amplitudinis Tuae
Uti Frater Studiosissimus
C. M. CARDLIS PEDICINI, *Præfus*
An. Maius Secus.

Romae, ex Aed. Sac. Congñis de Pñda Fide Die 19 Julii 1834.

R.P.D. JACOBO BRAMSTON
EPISCOPO USULENSI, VICARIO
APLĪCO LONDINENSI.

(2) ANSWER OF BISHOP BRAMSTON.[1]

EMINENTISSIME DÑE,

Me maxime consolor quotiescunque recordor Eminentiam Vestram et Sacram Congregationem non ignorare meam quotidianam sollicitudinem et promptum animum ad omnia negotia peragenda, quae mihi a S. Congñe tam honorifice concreduntur. Hinc tamen me maximo animi angore afficit, quod non possim nisi vulnus infensissimum conscientiae meae infligendo, adeoque nullo omnino modo possim, approbationem aut consensum praebere illi negotio, cui ut apparet per litteras ab Em̃. Vestra scriptas die 19, Julii 1834, Sac. Cong. me consentire vellet. Priusquam Emtiae Vestrae litterae in manus meas venerant, jam enim Rev^do. Admodum Dño R. Norris, Provinciali Soc. Jesu in Anglia, diu collocutus eram, qui mihi adfuerat animo me rogandi ut Rev^do Dño Randall Lythgoe, ejusdem Societatis presbytero, curam spiritualem Catholici gregis apud St. John's Wood demandarem. Huic petitioni, modo tamen ut confido, benignissimo, siquidem dicti Provincialis observantia mihi semper cara fuit, coactus sum firmam et praecisam repulsam dare. Emtīae Vestrae breviter exponam rationes ob quas tale consilium inii.

Catholici omnes tam pauperes quam divites, prope St. John's Wood degentes, sub spirituali regimine sacerdotum saecularium existunt, et ex unico earundem piissimarum sororum Gallini mecum colloquio, uno abhinc fere anno habito, et ex iis quae Procurator earundem mihi narravit, qui earum nomine petierat ut fierem unus ex Commissariis Capellae quam aedificaverant, planè intellexi hanc capellam sub eodem regimine esse futuram; adeoque gaudium testatus sum quod Capella erigenda foret apud St. John's Wood ad usum fidelium in illa vicinia degentium.

Attamen quinque fere abhinc mensibus primum didici ex epistola a dicto Procuratore scripta, piissimis Sororibus in animo esse ut PP. Jesuitis Capellam deferrent. Huic Epistolae sine mora respon-

[1] *Ibid.*

sum dedi, asserenda ea quae in illa epistola continebantur a me accurate perpendanda fore. Nec sane scio quid amplius dicere debuissem procuratori laico in re praesertim Ecclesiastica.

Ex eo tempore seriò et coram Deo hanc propositionem in mente persaepe revolvi, nec dubitavi consilia petere piissimi et prudentissimi Coadjutoris mei, nec non eruditissimorum, piissimorum et expertissimorum sacerdotum in meo Districtu.

Re tota perpensa, sicut mei officii et juris erat, et Regulis Missionum Anglicarum SSmi Patris Papae Benedicti XIV., in suo Brevi *Apostolicum Ministerium*, rite examinatis, et ex mea intima cognitione Cleri et gregis mihi crediti, et earum rerum quae illis maxime expedire certe scio, in praedictam firmam sententiam deveni, huic scilicet petitioni consensum dari non posse. Nam ex una parte, copiam satis amplam Sacerdotum saecularium habens, tam eorum qui jam officiis Ecclesiasticis funguntur, quam eorum qui parati a me talia munia jure expectant, et qui omnes huic Londinensi Missioni sunt juramento adstricti, ac moribus et scientia optimis instructi, cupiensque tranquillam permansuram esse Londinensem Missionem, quae remotis partium studiis, per plures annos, uno animo a Clero meo dilecto tam feliciter et tam fructuose pascitur et regitur: ex altera vero parte, memor dissidiorum maxime lugendorum quae a SSmo Papa Benedicto XIV enumerantur in Regulis Missionum quas supra memoravi et quae inter Regulares et Seculares olim asserunt, ac merito timens vel potius certo sciens, etiam ex iis quae in negotio, de quo nunc agitur pertractando jam evenerunt, perturbationes haud dissimiles fore excitandas: sed inter haec omnia nihil ferme prae oculis habens praeter eorum sanctificationem pro quibus mihi ratio ad Dei tribunal reddenda est, statui, charitate ut mihi videtur hoc manifeste exigente, templum praedictum nullius nisi Sacerdotis Saecularis curae credendum.

Ut huic infelici nogotio finis tandem imponatur, et ut nulla fiat infractio Legis Canonici Missionum Anglicarum ab omnibus cogniti, confido quod Sacra Congregatio id optimum judicabit, sicut et ego maxime expedire crederem, ut PP. Societatis Jesu declarent sese non posse hujusce Cappellae administrationem et curam accipere, et spero quod ad id efficiendum Sacra Cong. benigne suam amplissimam auctoritatem praebebit.

Eminentiae Vestrae, etc., etc., etc.,

J. Yorke Bramston, *Ep. Usul. V.A.L.*

Londini
Die 8 *Augusti*, 1834.

(3) Extract from the Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. to the Vicars Apostolic of England and Scotland, dated June 20, 1835.

Modo ad secundum querelarum caput transeamus. Dolet nobis quam maxime hic commemorare, quae circa Templi Londinensis traditionem Patribus Societatis Jesu faciendam locum habuerunt inter Congregnem de Prop. Fide et Venerabilem Fratrem Vicarium Apostolicum Londinensem; sed ut cognoscatur Sanctae hujus Sedis in eo etiam negotio indulgens circumspectio et moderatio omnino ea praeterire non possumus. Scripserat itaque nobis annuentibus eadem Congtio Londinensi Vicario sub die 19 Julii Ann. 1834 "id sibi valde utile videri (nempe templum illud tradere Jesuitis) ac pro certo se habere ipsum (Vicarium) nihil amplius prae oculis habentem, nisi Ecclesiae amplificationem et fidelium utilitatem, petitum consensum esse daturum, declarans quod eidem Congregationi id jucundissimum foret". Hisce autem officiosis Congnis insinuationibus et votis absolute respondit idem Vicarius Apostolicus sub die 8 Augusti 1834 "Se non posse nisi vulnus infensissimum conscientiae suae infligendo, adeoque nullo modo posse approbationem aut consensum praebere illi negotio". Et in quodam folio exhibito a dicti Vicarii Procuratore asseritur ipsum aperte testatum fuisse, ab Universo ejus Clero haberi, ut Religioni summopere injuriosum templum illud Jesuitis deferre et se nunquam id consensurum. Quid minus gratum hac responsione? Quomodo poterant injuriosius rejici Congregationis vota, quam denuntiando injuriosum, quod ipsa valde utile edixerat, insuper et profitendo non nisi inflicto propriae conscientiae infensissimo vulnere eisdem obsecundari posse? Profecto si quis inferre ex his vellet quanti apud talia respondentem habeatur dicta Congregatio eum forsan non bene erga ipsam affectum judicaret, quem tamen animo non talem esse credimus. Quid praeterea Jesuitis magis opprobrio esse potest, quam sic probrose repelli a Missionibus adeundis? Ceterum quae nimis dura de ipsis habet Londinensis Vicarius verba ea sibi veluti fortuito excidisse putandum est, cum aequum sit opinari, eum animo non desentire a reliquis Angliae Vicariis, quibuscumque doctrinae ac religionis zelo conjungitur, quosque ex certis et authenticis documentis in Congregationis Archivo existentibus, Nobis constat propensissimos esse in Jesuitarum Missiones hic fovendas. Interim, animadverte, Venerabilis Frater, quanta indulgentia ac moderatione usa fuerit eadem Congregatio, quae accepto hujusmodi injucundissimo responso hactenus siluit, hinc et illud attende, quam subtili arte in Vicariorum litteris ipsa praemoneatur, ne quod in votis tantum se habere patefecerat, id tandem jussis complere atque ad exitum perducere vetit.

APPENDIX E.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF "DISTRICTS" AND NEW RULES FOR THEIR ADMINISTRATION.

(1) "STATUTA PROVISORIA."

The *Statuta Provisoria*, drawn up by the Vicars Apostolic at their meeting at York in April, 1838, are contained in the following letter to Cardinal Fransoni, Prefect of Propaganda, dated June 11, 1838. A copy of the letter is among the *Westminster Archives* :—

EMINENTISSIME & RMĒ DMĒ,

Nos infrascripti Vicarii Aplīci Angliae, Emãae vestrae humiliter quae sequuntur exponimus, orantes ut ea Dño Nostro manifestare digneris.

Ex iis quae a Rmīs Vicariis Aplicīs. Medii et Londinensis Districtuum anno proxime elapso narrata sunt, nosti quosdam esse in Anglia tam Clericos quam Laicos, qui volunt numerum Vicariatuum apud nos augeri, Episcopos ordinarios fieri et a Capitulis seu Parochorum suffragiis eligi.

Cum autem SSmũs Dnũs Noster supradictis Rmis Collegis significare dignatus sit, velle se Vicarios Aplicos de his rebus inter se consulere et Ipsi quae statuissent referre, nos, ejusdem SSmi voluntati studiose obsequentes, die 23 Aprilis Eboraci convenimus, ubi, invocato Spiritus Sti numine de his aliisque curam nostram spectantibus, per duodecim fere dies deliberavimus, et unanimiter, quae sequuntur statuimus.

1° Valde optandum esse, ut Districtũum numerus, quamprimum commode fieri poterit, divisione factâ, augeatur; sed hoc ad tempus necessario suspendi debere, donec scilicet obviantia quaedam obstacula remota fuerint vel cessaverint.

2° Cum Sanctitas sua Rmis Collegis DD. Walsh et Griffiths significare dignata sit non sibi displicere ut Gubernium Ecclesiae Catholicae in Anglia assimiletur earum ecclesiarum formae quae ab ordinariis reguntur, retento tamen ad praesens Vicariorum Aplicõrum nomine, grato animo benignae SStatis sua voluntati annuendum esse decrevimus, et quo facilius sapientissima ejus consilia effectum sortiantur

sequentia tanquam statuta provisoria in singulis Districtibus introducenda et tenenda esse censuimus.

1° Ut Vicarius Apliçus, prout nunc fit, ad omnia nominet Officia, eaque ac facultates cujuscunque generis concedat, vel solummodo ad tempus vel ad beneplacitum.

2° Ut sit unus Vicarius Generalis pro singulis Districtibus.

3° Ut vicarii foranei pro diversis partibus cujusque Districtûs habeantur, ubi necessarium visum fuerit.

4° Ut habeantur quoque Archidiaconi, specialibus muniti facultatibus pro suo quisque Archidiaconatu.

5° Ut constituantur Rectores ecclesiarum, quorum munus sit totius gregis cuivis ecclesiae addicti curam gerere, tum in spiritualibus tum in temporalibus.

6° Subsidiarii adhibeantur Sacerdotes qui sub rectoribus operam dent saluti animarum.

7° Erigatur Episcopale Capitulum quod ad minus quinque et ad summum duodecim constet canonicis, a solo Epo eligendis ex Clero Districtûs.—Capituli partes sint, 1° Consilium dare Episcopo quaerenti in negotiis difficilibus, secreto inviolabiliter servato. 2° Adjuvare Episcopum in eligendo Coadjutore. 3° Defuncto Epõ, Capitularem eligere Vicarium (qui Districtui, vacante sede, praesit) et tria nomina seligere mittenda statim tum ad SStãtem suam, tum ad Seniorem ex Vicariis Aplicis, qui adhibito Collegarum suffragio, similiter tria nomina ad Stãtem suam mittat, ut ex utrisque successor defuncto Episcopo obtineatur.

In Coadjutore vel Vicario Aplico eligendo canonici eodem modo procedant ac Comitiae parochorum in Hibernia. Nunquam invaluit mos in Anglia ut Epi eligerentur suffragio parochorum, sed a Capitulo solo eligebantur. Aliter obtinuit in Hibernia.

Haec quidem a nobis unanimiter, ut dictum est, constituta ad Emam vestram mittere decreveramus, antequam pervenirent Eminentiae Vestrae litterae ad Rmũm Vicarium Apliçum Londinensem, die 19 Maii datae et ab eo caeteris Vicariis Aplicis communicatae. Pro his litteris maximas Emae vestrae gratias agimus. Cum autem ad ea quae continent non videamus quid addendum sit iis quae superius scripta sunt, restat solummodo precari Deum ut Emãm vestram diu sospitem et felicem servet.

Interim sumus

Eme Dme, Eminentiae Vestrae

Humillimi et obsequentissimi Servi,

Datum Die 11 Junii 1838. &c., &c.

Ad Em̃um et Rm̃um D.
Cardinalem Fransoni,
&c., &c.

(2) "Statuta Proposita."

These were drawn up in Rome, chiefly under the supervision of Monsignor Acton. They were printed, and copies are fairly commonly to be met with.

Statuta Proposita Pro Anglicanis Missionibus.

Catholicae Fidei in Britanniae Regionibus promovendae, ac propagandae studio pro suo munere Sacra haec Congregatio de Propaganda Fide intendens, rationum praeterea momenta perpendens, quae in eo Regno ad majus Religionis bonum procurandum persuadent nonnulla constitui debere, super negotio toto sententiam consiliumque amplissimorum Antistitum, qui Sedis Apostolicae nomine missionibus illis praesunt, exquirendum esse censuit. Haec autem sunt, quae S. Congregatio perficere cogitat.

1. Vicarios Apostolicos nova Regionum, seu Districtuum divisione augere.

2. Certam aliquam statuere methodum in electione Vicariorum Apostolicorum servandam.

3. Denique quaedam statuere, quae in persolvendo Vicarii Apostolici munere, valde videntur opportuna.

1. De Nova Districtuum Divisione, seu Circumscriptione.

Circa novam Districtuum circumscriptionem, hanc Religionis amplificationi S. Congregatio utilissimam fore judicat, atque ita fieri debere existimat, ut Octo ad minus sint in Angliae Regno Apostolicae Sedis Vicarii. Quod spectat vero ad Districtus eorum singulis assignandos, rationem habendam potius esse existimat ad locorum geographicam positionem, quam ad Ecclesiarum vulgo *Chappelle*, et Missionariorum numerum. Haec enim instabilia: illa vero vix, aut ne vix quidem ulli unquam variationi obnoxia est, ac deinde communicationum et pastoralium visitationum facilitati etiam consulitur. Limites itaque seu Regiones cujusvis Apostolici Vicariatus esse possent, ut sequitur.

1. Districtus Londinensis. Sex Commitatus, videlicet Middlesex, Berkshire, Essex, Surrey, Kent, et Hampshire, additis insuper Insulis Wight, et Jersey.

2. Districtus Occidentalis. Sex Comitatus, nempe Gloucester, Wiltshire, Somerset, Dorset, Devon, et Cornwall, additis parvis Insulis Scilly.

3. Districtus Orientalis. Undecim Comitatus, scilicet Huntingdon, Cambridge, Northampton, Rutland, Suffolk, Norfolk, Notting-

ham, Lincoln, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, et Buckinghamshire, addita Insula Ely.

4. Districtus Centralis. Sex Comitatus, Oxfordshire, Warwickshire, Worcestershire, Leicestershire, Staffordshire, et Derby.

5. Districtus Valliae. Principatus hujus nominis, et insuper Comitatus Monmouth, Hereford, et Shropshire, cum insula Anglesea.

6. Districtus Lancasterianus. Duo Comitatus, Lancastriae et Cheshire, nec non Insula Man.

7. Districtus Eboracensis. Comitatus ejusdem nominis.

8. Districtus Septentrionalis. Quatuor Comitatus, Durham, Westmoreland, Northumberland, et Cumberland.

His praehabitis, haec speciatim S. Congregatio ab amplissimis Vicariis Apostolicis quaerit:

1. An aequa sit, et perficienda ipsis videatur, superius descripta Vicariatuum Apostolicorum institutio, ac Districtuum Divisio, et Circumscriptio?

2. An quilibet Vicarius Apostolicus, praecipue tertii, quinti, et octavi Districtus, ex piis oblationibus, aliisque reditibus proprii Vicariatus, congrue suiipsius, ac suorum sustentationi, nec non sibi creditae Missionis necessitatibus occurrere ac providere valeat. Quatenus vero negative: An caeteri Praesules aliquod, et in specie quodnam pecuniae subsidium iisdem Vicariis quousque necessitas urgeat, praebere possent?

3. Quaenam statuenda sit Methodus ad componenda negotia, duobus pluribusve communia Comitatibus, qui anteactis temporibus ad unum, eundemque Vicariatum Apostolicum pertinentes, in supradicta nova Circumscriptione dividuntur?

4. An ad fovendam concordiam clerum inter saecularem, et regularem congruum esset, ex Vicariatibus Apostolicis *quintum Valliae*, nempe, Monachis Ordinis S. Benedicti Anglicanae Congregationis tribuere, ita ut iidem sponte et aequo animo reliquas Missiones dimitterent, habita compensatione domorum, ac Monasteriorum, quae in aliis Districtibus possident? Quatenus autem affirmative: An expediat, ut in eorum Districtu Vicarius Apostolicus pro tempore Praeses etiam sit Benedictinae Congregationis?

2. De Methodo in Electione Vicariorum Apostolicorum Servanda.

Ad gravissimum electionis Vicariorum Apostolicorum negotium rite absolvendum S.C. hanc quae sequitur methodum perficiendam esse arbitratur. Vicario Apostolico vita functo, vel alia de causa vacante Vicariatu alicujus Districtus, ejus Capitulum (de quo inferius erit sermo § 3) conveniet, et ad electionem Pro-Vicarii procedet

juxta formam a Sacris Canonibus praescriptam pro Vicariorum Capitularium electione. Pro-Vicarius autem Vicariatus administrationem geret usque ad novi Vicarii Apostolici ab Apostolica sede eligendi ac nominandi deputationem. Deinceps vero idem Capitulum una cum Pro-Vicario ex presbyteris sibi probe notis tres digniores proponet Summo Pontifici commendandos, quorum unus ab eodem Pontifice, si Ei placuerit, vacanti Vicariatui praeficiatur. Acta Capituli sub praesidentia Pro-Vicarii in forma supplicis Libelli ad Sedem Apostolicam mittentur. Hinc Pro-Vicarius hujusce electionis acta a se, et Capitularibus subscripta, et obsignata, omnibus, ac singulis Apostolicis Vicariis aliorum Districtuum transmittet, ut ii de commendatis tribus presbyteris sententiam suam, seniori Vicario mittendam, aperiant. Hic denique collectas eorum litteras ad S. Congregationem perferendas curabit. Quod si de electione agatur Coadjutoris alicui ex Vicariis Apostolicis assignandi, Vicarius ipse Apostolicus Capitulo penes se coacto ad propositionem, ut supra, trium presbyterorum qui summo Pontifici pro Coadjutoris munere commendentur, procedet. Hinc selectos viros, et causas, quibus Coadjutoris auxilio ipse indiget, caeteris Vicariis Apostolicis patefaciet, ut ii suam, tam super commendatis presbyteris, quam super asserta Coadjutoris necessitate pandant S. Congregationi. Acta Capituli, et Sententiae Vicariorum Apostolicorum ad S. Cong. mittentur modo superius significato. Haec sunt quae S. C. generatim pro electione Vicariorum Apostolicorum decerni posse judicat, ac super his etiam responsum petit sequentibus quaestionibus:

1. An turbarum ac dissidiorum timor, in hac servanda methodo electionum ex parte Missionariorum, qui Capitulum constituent, esse possit, etiam si electio fiat per secreta suffragia?

2. Obessetne inter electores Capitulares, regulares etiam, si qui sunt, in Districtu, presbyteros adnumerare, necnon primoribus Rectoribus Ecclesiarum suffragium in electionibus tribuere?

3. De Vicariatuum Apostolicorum Regimine.

Quamquam S. C. in votis esset eam regiminis formam in Anglicanis Missionibus praescribere, quae juxta Sacrorum Canonum Statuta in Episcopalibus seu titularibus Ecclesiis asservatur; attamen in præsenti rerum statu Religioni valde congruit, ut illae sub eodem titulo, et Apostolicorum Vicariorum regimine perseverent. Interim vero S. eadem Congregatio summopere exoptat, quemlibet Vicarium Apostolicum unum tantumodo habere Vicarium Generalem ab ipso electum ex presbyteris ejusdem, si fieri possit, Districtus. Alios autem Vicarios Foraneos eliget pro suo arbitrio, et pro opportunitate ac diversitate locorum. Cuilibet Ecclesiae, sive, ut ajunt, Sacello Rector

praeficiatur, qui Parochi munere fungatur, eique, si necessitas urgeat, unus pluresve adjungantur presbyteri in subsidium ad parochialia munia obeunda. Peropportunum etiam videtur, ut unusquisque Vicarius Apostolicus quoddam veluti Capitulum in suo Districtu instituat duodecim saltem presbyterorum, non exclusis etiam, si sunt, Regularibus. Hujusce Capituli munus erit Vicarium Apostolicum in arduis negotiis consilium exposcentem juvare; eodem Vicario vita functo, Pro-Vicarium constituere, presbyteros designare Apostolicae Sedi commendandos, ut § 2 dictum est. Ad haec vero, et alia similia definienda S. C. quaerit:

1. An ea Vicariis Apostolicis conservanda seu tribuenda sit auctoritas, quam hactenus exercuerunt, ita ut juris illorum sit quodcumque officium conferre, et pro suo arbitrio ac nutu facultates Sacellorum Rectoribus, hoc est Parochis, jam concessas auferre?

2. An aliqua, et quaenam praescribi posset super hisce servanda regula?

3. In obitu alicujus Capitularis presbyteri, vel alia de causa Capituli membris imminutis, utrum Apostolici Vicarii arbitrio relinquenda electio Sacerdotum pro Capituli ipsius complemento, an potius eidem Capitulo tribuenda facultas tres viros digniores eligendi, ac Vicariis proponendi, ut ex iis, qui ei magis placuerit, seligat, et in Capitulum adsciscat? Quae hactenus dicta sunt Religionis incrementa in Anglicanis Missionibus vel maxime profutura esse S. C. videntur, ita ut mens ejus sit acceptis ab Apostolicis Vicariis responsis atque suffragiis, ea qua oportet prudentia ac maturitate in ordinem illa dirigere, et ad exitum perducere.

De Coloniarum Missionibus.

Non minori autem studio eadem S. C. reliquas Anglicanas Missiones fovere cupiens ad Colonias Britanniae Regno subjectas omnem curam ac sollicitudinem suam contulit, ut earum quoque necessitatibus occurrat atque prospiciat. Tria vero praecipue sunt, quae iis in locis Catholicae Religionis progressus retardare compertum est:

1. Subsidiorum defectus, unde vilescunt, aut omnino desunt Ecclesiae, nec non scholae pro pueris Catholicis erudiendis, piaeque aliae ejusmodi institutiones.

2. Eadem de causa Operariorum paucitas, quamvis in tanta regionum amplitudine messis multa esse posset.

3. Denique expeditae, ac directae relationis, vel communicationis inter Apostolicam Sedem, et Missiones illas difficultas. Ad haec removenda impedimenta atque incommoda, tria quoque praesto essent remedia: super quibus tamen, antequam quidquam statu-

atur, quid Vicarii Apostolici Britanniae Regni, auditis antea Coloniarum Missionum Praesulibus, opinentur, S. C. exquirendum esse judicat. Remedia autem proposita sunt:

1. Erectio in tribus Angliae, Hiberniae, et Scotiae Regnis piae Societatis pro subveniendis oblationibus suis, Coloniarum Missionibus, ad tramites illius Lugdunensis nuncupatae, *Association de la propagation de la Foi*, quae nunc in Hibernia quoque pro Fidei propagatione instituta est.

2. Erectio magni Seminarii Missionum exclusive pro Coloniis ad instar Seminarii Parisiensis Missionum *ad Exteros*.

3. Denique deputatio Agentis Generalis pro iisdem Coloniis, qui Londini moram faciens peculiarem habeat Missionum illarum curam ac sollicitudinem, qui medium sit inter illas et Apostolicam Sedem facilioris ac tutioris communicationis, qui denique gravia illarum negotia penes etiam Britanniae Gubernium tueatur, et curet.

1. De Erectione Societatis ad Coloniarum Subveniendas Missiones.

Pia haec Societas in memoratis Angliae Regnis erigenda exemplum sumere posset a Lugdunensi, ita ut in quolibet Apostolico Vicariatu Britanniae, et Scotiae, nec non in qualibet, Hiberniae Dioecesi constituantur particularia Consilia, quae ex Vicariatu ipso, aut Dioecesi, ubi constituta sunt, nomen accipient. Membra hujusmodi Conciliorum seligi debent ex piissimis, ac spectatissimis viris Ecclesiasticis ac Laicis, eorumque munus erit oblatas a sodalibus eleemosynas colligere, et societatem ipsam pro viribus in Vicariatu, vel Dioecesi propagare. Praeter autem particularia memorata Consilia aliud quoque Generale statuendum erit ad instar Lugdunensis, quod caeteris praeerit, ejusque officium sit a particularibus Consiliis delatas eleemosynas in unum colligere, ut ex iis subsidia quotannis ad Vicarios Apostolicos Coloniarum habita ratione cujusvis Missionis necessitatis transmittere: quolibet trimestri Diarium, seu relationes de rebus Ecclesiasticis aliisque ad Catholicam Religionem in iisdem Coloniis pertinentibus typis edere, et in postremo cujuslibet anni fasciculo accuratam exhibere rationem tam introitus, quam exitus pecuniarum. Super his autem duo haec S. C. ab Apostolicis Vicariis quaerit:

1. Sperandumne sit Catholicos in tribus Britanniae Regnis nomen opemque supradictae Societati daturos?

2. An congruum esset loco unius, duo Generalia Consilia constituere, alterum Londini, Dublini alterum, quemadmodum duo sunt in Gallia, Lugdunense scilicet, ac Parisiense?

2. De Fundatione Seminarii Missionum Pro Coloniis.

Perspicue patet quinam sit finis, et quaenam, quantaque utilitas hujusce Institutionis. Ex ea enim tanquam ex uberrimo constantique fonte ad irrigandam Domini vineam indesinentes aquae dimanabunt, Operarii nempe Evangelici ad omnem pietatem, et scientiam comparati. Hac autem in re S. C. pariter quaerit:

1. Sperarine possent a Coloniarum et Britanniae Gubernio, saltem ex parte, subsidia hujusce Seminarii, fundationi, et conservationi necessaria?

2. Opportunumne erit in Angliae Regno, vel potius in Hibernia idem Seminarium erigere?

3. Soline Presbyteri, ac Diaconi, ad instar Seminarii Parisiensis admittendi essent inter Alumnos, vel etiam Clerici Minores?

3. De Agentis Generalis Pro Coloniis Deputatione.

Multa quidem, ut supra dictum est, ac maxima commoda S. C. confidit Coloniarum allaturam esse Missionibus Agentis hujusce Generalis deputationem, cujus muneris erit:

1. Assiduam cum illis Praesulibus relationem et epistolare commercium habere.

2. Certiorem S. Congregationem de omnibus reddere.

3. Missionum negotia penes etiam Britanniae Gubernium tueri, ac pertractare, quin Apostolici Vicarii Londinum sese conferre, ac Missiones deserere cogantur.

4. Alumnos Coloniarum Seminario comparare.

5. Exploratam notitiam petere a singulis Apostolicis Vicariis meritorum Sacerdotum, qui, data occasione, ad Episcopalem Dignitatem promoveri possent, et Vicariatuum Regimini praefici.

6. Secretarii munere fungi penes Centrale, seu Generale Londinense Consilium supermemoratae Societatis pro colligendis eleemosynis.

7. Denique de Missionum statu, aliisque omnibus, quae ad Catholicam Religionem quovis modo spectare possent, ad S. C. accurate, ac frequenter scribere.

Quaerit hinc Sacra Congregatio:

1. Quidnam praemii sive annui redditus assignandum esset huic Agenti, ad congruam ejusdem Londini commorantis sustentationem; nec non pro expensis necessariis ad rite, honesteque implendas omnes muneris sui partes?

2. Quidnam quilibet Vicarius Apostolicus Coloniarum Agenti tribuere posset pro honesta ejusdem sustentatione?

3. An Britanniae Gubernium aegre ferret hujusce Agentis deputationem, et an illi opponi forsan posset lex, quae dicitur *praemunire*?

(3) Answer of Vicars-Apostolic.[1]

Emme. et Rm̃e Dn̄e,

Cum Londinum convenerimus ut de duobus Decretis nuper a S. Congn̄e ad nos missis deliberaremus, non omisimus animum diligenter intendere ad "Statuta proposita pro Anglicanis Missionibus"; quae quamvis graviora sint, quam ut de singulis satis respondeamus, tamen gratum speramus S. Congn̄i fore ea sentiri, quae communi et unanimi sententia nobis visa sunt.

1o Igitur decrevimus maximas S. Congn̄i reddendas esse gratias pro summa diligentiâ et singulari prudentia in iis excogitandis et proponendis, quae ad majus religionis bonum in hoc regno procurandum conducant, et prasertim quia in hoc negotio suggestionibus nostris magna ex parte uti dignata sit. Hinc perpauca sunt quae non probanda et grato animo amplectenda censemus. Quae autem hæc sunt ex responsionibus ad quaesita nobis proposita satis patebit.

Ad Quaesita § 1ae respondemus:

Districtui Londinensi addatur comitatus Hertford quia ibi situm est seminarium Districtus Londinensis.

In districtu Orientali omittantur Comitatus Hertford et Nottingham.

Districtui centrali addatur Nottingham.

A 2m Affirmative Si Districtus Wallice detur Benedictinis, aliter, negative.

Quamvis media nobis nunc temporis desint necessitatibus tertii et octavi Districtuum providendi, conabimur pro viribus media quam primum comparare, modo interim Benedictini pro quinto Districtu providerint.

Ad 3m Nulla specialis methodus praescribi potest; res relinquatur Vics Aplic̄s duorum comitatuum.

[2] Ad 4m Unanimiter statueramus Districtum *Centralem* non posse tribui Benedictinis; magnopere autem optandum esse, ut Districtus *Walliae* ipsis daretur.

Arbitramur nihil magis conducere posse ad concordiam fovendam non solum inter clerum saecularem et regularem, sed inter ipsos fideles laicos, qui jam saepius misere in partes scinduntur. Hinc Vicarius Aplicus Occid: libenter cedet Comitatus Monmouth et Hereford, quamvis ex melioribus sui Districtus partibus sint, et Vics Ap: Medius Comitatum Salopiensem itidem cedere paratus est.

Arbitramur expedire ut Vics Aplic̄us pro tempore praeses sit Bened: Congn̄is. sed id S. Congn̄i et ipsis Benedictinis esse linquendum.

[1] *Westminster Archives.*

[2] Antequam de errore Amanuensis, qui *centralem* loco Walliae scripserat certiores facti fueramus.

Ad quaesita § 2ae respondemus:

Ad 1um Negative, si electio fiat per secreta suffragia.

Ad 2m De regularibus affirmative, nisi sint subditi Epi. De rectoribus ecclesiarum, etiam affirmative: tales enim admittere nostra sententia abesset.

Ad quaesita § 3ae respondemus:

Ad 1m relinquendam omnino Vics Apličis totam auctoritatem quam nunc habent.

Ad 2um Nullam novam regulam praescribendam, quamdiu Epi sint Vic. Aplič.

Ad 3m Arbitramus linquendam esse V. Apliči arbitrio electionem omnium membrorum sui capituli; nec convenire ut Capitulum tria nomina proponat.

N.B. Censemus capitulum non debere constari duodecim saltem Presbyteris, cum in aliquibus Districtibus impossibile foret tot idoneos invenire; sed sex ad *minus* nec plures quam duodecim.

2o De coloniarum missionibus haec solummodo nunc temporis respondere possumus:

Deesse omnino media ad seminarium pro coloniis erigendum vel ad sustentationem Agentis Londini commorantis.

Nescimus utrum Catholici in tribus Britanniae regnis media necessaria suppeditare possent; ut autem S. Congñis votis obtemperaremus, statim collatis cum quibusdam nobilibus viris conciliis, erectionem societatis ad colligendas eleemosynas in Anglia ad normam Lugdunensis auspicati sumus. Post aliquot menses patebit quid de hoc fonte sperandum sit, quando caeteris S. Congñis quaesitis respondere conabimur.

Liceat nobis per istam occasionem S. Congñi notum facere nos recursum habuisse ad summum Pontificem de duobus S. Congñis Decretis nuper ad nos missis. Speramus S. Congregationem perspecturam aliud nobis non restasse remedium ad mala ingentia, quae nos urgerent, avertenda; jam enim coeperunt quidam publice jactitare se jam posse ecclesias edificare etc. etc. ubi velint.

Sacram purpuream reverenter osculantes, sumus

Emẽ et Revne Dñe

Emae Vestrae obmi servi

+ P. A. Baines, *V.A.Occ.*

+ T. Walsh, *V.A.M.*

+ J. Briggs, *V.A.S.*

+ T. Griffiths, *V.A.L.*

Datum Londini, die 30 Novembris, 1838.

Ad Emũm et revmum Dñm Cardinalem Fransoni
S. Congñis de Prop: Fide Prafectum, Romae.

(4) Draft Petition to the Holy See, signed by the Benedictine Titular Abbots and Cathedral Priors, asking for an Influential Share in the Episcopate, whether Titular or Vicarial, as they had before had in Catholic England.

The following document is preserved at Downside Abbey. Being in English, it is probably a translation; but whether the Latin petition was ever presented or not, there is nothing to show.

To His Holiness Gregory the 16th.

Most Holy Father,

We, the members of the English Benedictine Congregation, the lawful and admitted descendants of the illustrious body of Benedictines in England, prostrate at the feet of our most holy Father, profess the same undiminished attachment to the See of St. Peter which in Catholic times, and in all succeeding ages, has been shown by our Benedictine ancestors.

The Sacred Congregation has signified that it is highly advantageous to religion to retain our present form of vicarial government. Intimately connected with this country as we are, we think the same: and are of opinion that neither the Vicars Apostolic nor the Clergy, Secular or Regular, and still less the Laity, are yet prepared for a return to Titular or Ordinary government. We have also serious doubts, when we witness the jealousy and prejudice of our protestant fellow-countrymen against our holy religion, whether our Civil Rulers might not be forced to interfere in our assumption of the title of Ordinary Bishops, and thus perhaps by new enactments retard the gradual progress of Catholicity amongst us.

We are further of opinion that the proposed intentions of your paternal government, of giving us a new division of our districts, of intrusting the election of our Vicars Apostolic to the rectors of churches both of the regular and secular Clergy; and of the appointment of Deans and Chapters, composed both of regular and secular Clergy, would be the most safe and prudent preparation to an ultimate return to our ancient hierarchy.

But, nevertheless, if the superior wisdom of your Holiness and the Sacred Congregation apprehends no danger from our Civil Rulers in our assuming the title of Ordinaries, if you consider that we are otherwise prepared, and that it is both expedient and necessary to return to the government of Ordinaries, then we, the members of the English Benedictine Congregation, prostrate at the feet of our most holy Father, most humbly and earnestly pray that your Holiness will carefully adhere to ancient precedent, and restore to us our

ancient hierarchy, founded on those principles, which were admitted in this country for many ages, and confirmed by a long line of Venerable Pontiffs, your illustrious Predecessors, until the unhappy schism of Henry the 8th separated this country from the communion of the See of Rome.

We cannot doubt but that following the footsteps of your Venerable Predecessors, your Holiness will ever remember that this country was indebted, under God, for its conversion to the zeal and labours of St. Augustine and other monks; and that the monks were authorised by Gregory the Great, of happy memory, and by other succeeding Pontiffs, to administer parochial sacraments. The Regular orders, at the time of our unfortunate schism, were actually in the possession of, and served at least one-third of all the parochial Churches in England: and we confidently trust, that on our return to ordinary government, your Holiness will confirm these, and all other peculiar rights and privileges sanctioned by your illustrious Predecessors, and ever enjoyed by the Monastic bodies in this country.

No one will know better than your Holiness, that for ages there were Benedictine Monasteries attached to certain Cathedrals in this country; and that the prior and monks formed the Cathedral Chapters to those sees, and possessed the canonical right of electing their bishops, and all other rights and privileges belonging to Cathedral Chapters.

At the time when Henry the 8th plunged this country into its lamented schism, the Catholic Church of England was composed of a hierarchy consisting of two archbishops and nineteen bishops, and the election to all these sees was vested in the Cathedral Chapters, whether regular or secular.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, the first in dignity and pre-eminence was elected by the prior and monks of the Benedictine monastery attached to the Cathedral of Canterbury. We wish particularly to draw the attention of your Holiness to the decision of your illustrious Predecessor, Innocent the 3rd, who, on hearing the claims of the suffragan bishops of the province of Canterbury to interfere in the election of their archbishop, definitely pronounced in 1206, that the election of the archbishop was vested solely in the Benedictine Chapter.

The bishops of six sees, viz. Winchester, Durham, Ely, Worcester, Norwich, and Rochester, were elected by the cathedral prior and monks of the Benedictine monasteries attached to their several cathedrals. The bishop of the See of Carlisle was elected by the canons regular of St. Augustine. The Archbishop of York was

elected by the dean and secular canons of his cathedral; as were also the six bishops of London, Salisbury, Exeter, Hereford, Lincoln, and Chichester by the deans and secular canons of their respective cathedrals. The four bishops of St. David's, St. Asaph's, Bangor, and Landaff situated in the principality of Wales, were elected by the dean and secular canons of their cathedrals. The bishops of the two remaining sees, that of Coventry and Lichfield, and that of Bath and Wells, were elected by the conjoint suffrages of Benedictine monks and secular canons. A dean and secular canons possessed the cathedral of Lichfield; Benedictine monks possessed the cathedral monastery of Coventry. The right of election to this bishoprick was disputed, and the illustrious predecessor to your Holiness, Gregory the 9th, decided in the year 1228, that the right of electing their bishop belonged equally to the Benedictine monks and secular canons of both cathedrals. A dispute also arose between the Benedictine monks of the cathedral monastery of Bath and the secular canons of Wells, as to the election of their bishop, and Innocent the 4th, the illustrious Predecessor of your Holiness, decided, in the year 1244, that the right of electing their bishop belonged equally to the Benedictine monks and the secular canons of the respective cathedrals.

We beg, most earnestly, to draw the attention of your Holiness to the precedents established by these two sees, as equity would seem to require that the same economy be observed in the union of dioceses which will be inevitable on the restoration of our hierarchy: and that if two sees are united, where one of the cathedrals was in the possession of the Benedictine monks, and the other in that of the secular canons, the right of election ought to be vested in the chapters of the Benedictine and secular clergy of the united dioceses.

We have ever cherished these peculiar rights of the Benedictine cathedral priors and chapters as the most valuable and glorious privileges of our Benedictine forefathers; and, in obedience to your illustrious Predecessor, Urban the 8th, in his Bulla "Plantata," we have carefully kept up the canonical election of these cathedral priors, looking forward to the ultimate restoration of our ancient hierarchy, when they would return to their canonical rights and privileges.

Innocent the 12th, the illustrious Predecessor of your Holiness, annulled the jurisdiction of regular and secular chapters, as long only as the English Catholic Church was governed by vicars apostolic. If then the time be come when the government by vicars apostolic is to cease, and the restoration of the hierarchy is both expedient and necessary, we, the members of the English Benedictine Con-

gregation, humbly and earnestly pray that your Holiness will strictly adhere to the prescription of ages, to the repeated decisions of your venerable Predecessors, and restore to our Congregation those rights and privileges enjoyed as long as the hierarchy existed by our Benedictine ancestors.

In conclusion, we confidently trust that your Holiness will ever bear in mind the fatal suppression of the Benedictine and other religious bodies in this country, and that your Holiness will carefully restore to us those peculiar rights and privileges which we lost through our attachment to the See of St. Peter.

Earnestly beseeching our merciful God long to preserve your Holiness to govern this Church with wisdom and justice, we humbly crave your apostolical benediction.

The above signed by me Richard Marsh, Abbot, Prest General of the English Congregation of Benedictines and Cathedral Prior of the Metropolitan Chapter of Canterbury, in the names also of the other eleven Cathedral Priors named below, acknowledged in Bulla Plantata, and in [the sd work ?] of Benedict 14th entitled, de Synodo Dioecesana.

WILFRID FISHER, *Abbot, Cathedral Prior of Durham.*
JOSEPH BROWN *of Winchester.*
BERNARD RIDING *of Rochester.*
JOHN TURNER *of Worcester.*
FRANCIS COOPER *of Bath.*
OSWALD TALBOT *of Coventry.*
BERNARD BARBER *of Chester.*
GEORGE TURNER *of Gloucester.*
BEDE DAY *of Peterborough.*
AUSTIN ROLLING *of Norwich.*
BERNARD ROBINSON *of Ely.*

LIVERPOOL, 27 *Septr.* 1839.

APPENDIX F.

THE PRIVILEGES OF REGULARS.

(1) Decree as to Indulgences.

Decretum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.

Quum jam pridem ac saepe saepius per Angliae Christifideles SSmo. Domino nostro Gregorio Divina Providentia PP. XVI preces exhibitae fuerint ad hoc ut pretiosi Indulgentiarum aliorumque spiritualium charismatum thesauri, quorum fructu singulari fere exemplo, ob temporum calamitatem, jam inde a superiori saeculo illius Regni incolae magna ex parte sunt destituti, iterum panderentur, Sanctitas sua animadvertens petitionem eorum non modo piam laudabilemque, sed presentibus Christianae reipublicae casibus accommodatam esse, quippe quia temporum ac rerum prorsus immutata conditione prohibitionis illius quae a S. M. Benedicto XIV in constitutione cujus initum *Apostolicum Ministerium* facta est potissima causa desiisse videtur, in Audientia quam habuit iv Nonas proxime elapsas, apud eundem Sanctissimum, infrascriptus Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide Secretarius benigne annuit ut Angliae Fideles participes fiant omnium Indulgentiarum ac privilegiorum quibus gaudent universi per ecclesiam fideles adscripti sacris aggregationibus Sanctissimi Cordis Jesu, Beatissimae Virginis de Monte Carmelo, Sacratissimi Rosarii, Bonae Mortis, aliisque id genus, ideoque veniam mandavit Ordinibus Regularibus et Saecularibus Presbyteris qui potestatem pollent adscribendi supradictis aggregationibus, ut libere valeant per totam Angliam hujusmodi facultatem exercere. Confidit autem Sanctitas sua perspectae pietati Vicariorum Apostolicorum acceptissimum id fore, eosque sedulam operam navaturos, ut memoratae Aggregationes quae ad fidem et devotionem fovendam sint constitutae, ea qua par est religione et pietate ubique propagentur; et ideo non modo superius laudata Constitutioni, sed etiam quibuscunque aliis in contrarium facientibus penitus derogat.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus dictae Sacrae Congregationis die 29 Septembris anno 1838.

Gratis, sine ulla omnino solutione quocunque titulo.

J. PH. CARD. FRANSONIUS, *Praefectus.*
J. ARCHIEP. EDESS., *a Secretis.*

(2) DECREE AS TO BUILDING CHURCHES.

Decretum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.

Ad aures Sanctissimi Domini nostri Gregorii, Div. Pro. PP. XVI pervenit, nonnullos in Angliae Regno dubitari quin Regulares Ordines post constitutionem S. M. Benedicti XIV quae incipit *Apostolicum Ministerium* possint ibi ecclesias construere et aedificare. Quae quidem prohibitio licet in praefata Constitutione minime expressa reperiri videatur, tamen Sanctitas sua in audientia quam habuit iv Nonas proxime elapsas apud eumdem SSmum Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide secretarius infrascriptus, declaravit non obstantibus praedicta Constitutione aliisque contrariis quibuscunque Religiones Ordines posse Ecclesias publicas aedificare et retinere, ita tamen ut si qua peculiaris ratio in aliquo casu suaderet Ecclesiarum praefatarum constructionem exequi non debere, id Sacrae huic Congregationi per Apostolicos Vicarios referri mandaverit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus dictae S. Congregationis, die 29 Septembris 1838.

Gratis, sine ulla omnino solutione quocunque titulo.

J. PH. FRANSONIUS, *Praefectus.*
J. ARCHIEP. EDESSEN, *a Secretis.*

PROPAGANDA, *13th March*, 1839.

(3) LETTER OF CARDINAL FRANSONI TO DR. WISEMAN.

(The following is Dr. Wiseman's own translation: a copy is at the English College, Rome.)

In reply to your letter of the 5th instant, by which in the name of the Right Reverend Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District of England you ask for some explanation regarding the Decrees of the S. Congregation of Propaganda of the 29th of September of last year, the undersigned Cardinal Prefect has to reply that it is evident that the respective special provisions of the bull of Benedict XIV *Apostolicum Ministerium* being withdrawn, things return in England itself also to the order prescribed by the Jus Commune. Therefore according to the prescriptions of the Council of Trent, before publishing any new Indulgence, the Vicars Apostolic as true ordinaries have the right to verify its authenticity, which verification however has not

to take place regarding the Indulgences of the Confraternities or pious Associations enumerated in the aforesaid decrees of September 29, 1838, both because those are Indulgences already for a long time everywhere published, and because their authenticity in England has been now solemnly proclaimed by the same Decrees of this said Congregation.

With regard to the new Churches of Regulars, it is undeniable that the consent of the Ordinaries is requisite; but the Sacred Congregation, conformably to the Common Law, to avoid the evil effect of any less equitable refusal, such as has occasionally been given under the sanction of the aforenamed Constitution of Benedict XIV, has thought itself bound to remove such obstacles and recall to mind that such a refusal can never be made without just grounds, reserving to itself the examination of such grounds whenever any Vicar should think that he cannot grant his consent to the erection or opening of any new church.

The Holy See has thus extended to England those provisions which are generally in force in all countries, however subject to governments heterodox, schismatic, or pagan, and which are likewise faithfully observed in all the other British dominions, from which it was not reasonable that the island of England should alone differ.

You will communicate these sentiments to the parties who commissioned you, and having nothing further to add, the undersigned subscribes himself, &c., &c.

(Signed) G. F. Cardinal Fransoni.

(4) Formal Explanation of the Decree as to Building Churches, in a Letter from Cardinal Fransoni to each of the Vicars Apostolic.

Illme. ac Revme Dñe,

Certior factus nonnullos diversimode eas interpretatos esse illustrationes quas mense Maii proxime elapsi Apostolici Vicarii Septentrionalis Districtus nomine circa edicta 3 Kalendas Octobris anni 1838 a Sacra hac Congregatione decreta, fueram efflagitatus ut quaecumque minus recta interpretatio arceatur, utque cuilibet incommodo quod ex ea proficisci posset aditus omnino praecludatur, necessarium in praesentia duco Amplitudini tuae patefacere, quid praesuli Wiseman Britannicorum Antistitum vices apud Apostolicam Sedem gerenti responderim quum me ea de re percontatus est.

Cum itaque per ea decreta peculiares Benedicti XIV praescriptiones in Bulla *Apostolicum Ministerium* de medio sublatae essent, monui res ecclesiasticas et in Britanniae regione quoad ea omnia restitui ad quae eadem Decreta juxta ordinem a communi jure canonico re-

stitutum referuntur, cui sane juri eximii illius Pontificis Bulla aliqua derogare ex parte videbatur. Atque ideo dixi indulgentias quidem omnes Fidelibus universis concessas ad Angliam pariter ac ad ceteras terrarum orbis regiones pertinere. Verumtamen juxta Tridentinae Synodus praescripta inquirendum esse an nova quaelibet indulgentia authentica foret, antequam in apertum referretur. At vero illud praeterea subjeci, eam scilicet inquisitionem adhibendam non esse, quoad sodalitia piasque societates in iis Decretis designatas, quod pro illis ei sollemnitati sacrae hujus Congregationis decretum suppleverat. Quod vero ad nova templa attinet, quae vel acquiruntur a Religiosis vel ab iisdem extruuntur aut dono accipiuntur, equidem reposui Ordinarii Episcopi assensum requiri ut ea Fidelibus patefiant. Verum et illud addidi Sacram Congregationem in hoc quoque voluisse abusionibus occurrere, quae post erroneam Benedictinae Constitutionis accommodationem nimis profecto invaluerant, dum statuebatur ut hac super re eae servarentur in Anglia Canonicae sanctiones quae fideles caeterarum orbis plagarum respiciunt. At enim licet juxta eas pro recentiorum templorum apertione suum praebere assensum renueret Ordinarius, (qui quidem assensus absque gravi ac justissima causa nec denegari potest nec debet), Sacrae tamen huic Congregationi rem perpendere ac judicium de ea proferre reservabatur, ut si forte Ordinarius immerito obstitisset, obex quicumque per facultatem ab eadem concessam removeretur. Neque aliter agitur quoad regiones Catholicas.

Caeteris quoque Amplitudinis tuae Collegis explanationis meae summam communico, ut ad eam quando necesse fuerit conformari valeant.

Interim Deum precor ut Amplitudinem tuam diu sospitem ac felicem servet.

Amplitudinis tuae,
uti frater studiosissimus
J. Ph. Card. Fransonius,
Praef.

Romae ex aed. Sac. Congtnis de Propa Fid.
die 5 *Septembris* 1839.

APPENDIX G.

EXTRACT OF PRINTED LETTER FROM POPE GREGORY XVI. TO THE CLERGY OF LONDON, IN ANSWER TO THEIR SUPPLICATIO OF MAY, 1840.

Res autem nunc monet ut dicam aliquid de ecclesiis aedificandis, unde tanta primum inta vos, spirituales mei helluones, orta trepidatio. Sciatis igitur, quod ad me attinet, dilectissimi filii, nihil mihi optatius contingere posse, nihil enim cupio ardentius, quam ut urbem Londinum totam esse refertam ecclesiis Catholicis, quam primum a vobis intelligam. Aedificent divites, aedificent aemulando contributionibus suis mediocres atque pauperes; auctore potissimum atque impulsore me, omnes omnium religiosorum hominum ordines, ad hoc opus praeclarissimum incumbant. Dicant audacter aedificatores, vetanti Episcopo ne fiat, *per summum Pontificem licet.* Neque vero (dum hoc quoque dum his immoror, notandum est,) opinio ulla perniciosior, magisque ad ardorem illum nobilissimum in ecclesiis aedificandis restinguendum accommodata dispergi inter vos potest quum illa quae ab Episcopo vestro in libello quodam nuper edito, qui inscribitur—*The Catholic Directory*—inculcata est; nempe, "numquam fuisse auditum gentem ullam a Sancta Sede per schisma divulsam ad gremium ecclesiae sponte sua rediisse." Quo enim pertinere potest talis hoc tempore minime inculcanda sententia nisi ad cohibendum generosum istum Catholicorum globum, extruendis ecclesiis, tanta contentione animi, et manibus tam largiter effusis, incumbentem? Quo pertinent inquam, observationes Episcopi vestri, nisi ad retentandos sublimiores se ipso spiritus, conversionum avidissimos? Quae autem regio in terris, sapientem vestrum Episcopum libens interrogaverim, unquam fuit per eosdem gubernantium artes vaferrimas, religionis avorum suorum spoliata, quibus vestra infelicissima patria? Ubi ergo nulla in rebus tam magni momenti similitudo est, cur ille similitudinem effectus tam perniciosi inducit? Enimvero, carissimi filii, cogor dicere quod silere omnino praetulerim, ad restituendam religionem Catholicam in Anglia,

"*Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis*
Tempus eget."

Ad hoc, quid causae est, auribus Episcopi vestri intonuerim, cur hostes religionis nostrae infensissimi ita nunc trepidant ac religionis suae, licet armis ad custodiendam eam undique circumseptae, securitati diffidant? Quid causae est cur omnes fere qui inter eos acerrimo ingenio sunt, sicut et magna pars vulgi hebetioris, inviti agnoscant, Religionem Catholicam non lento quidem gradu in Angliam circumvolvi, sed saltu quodam incredibili ac non obsistendo, in sedes suas avitas reverti? Postremo, quae unquam gens, ubi religio Catholica deperiit, schismaticos suos doctissimos in Universitatibus tam opulenter dotatis monstrare potuit, quasi Dei Omnipotentis subito instructu, pro veritate Religionis Catholicae, omnia omnis vetustatis rimantes argumenta, et gratuito expromentes, et pro bono publico uberrime profundentes, ut conspicere est hodie in *Puseitis?* Si ergo hic vester Episcopus, solus in tanta claritate rerum, albescens super Angliam coelum non videt, tanto magis mihi atque vobis cavendum est, filii mei carissimi, ne vestri laicorumque per Angliam oculi, iisdem illis nubibus, quibus sui, circumfundantur. Fieri enim non potest, ut quibus haec ejus persuasio inest, vel ad convertendas animas more Jesuitarum insatiabiliter se applicent, vel aedificandis ecclesiis ad conversos accipiendos, faveant.

Cavete igitur, vos filii mei dilectissimi, ne in talibus hisce rebus, dum Episcopo vestro, qui concessa potestati ejus, dolens dico, nonnunquam egreditur, obsequentes esse videamini, Episcopo Episcoporum obsequium abnuatis, vel saltem vos ei non satis morigeros praebeatis. Episcopo vestro pars tantum tutandae ecclesiae commissa est; nobis praecipua rerum ad publicam utilitatem dirigenda; nobis perspiciendum est, ne in vestra quoque regione res Catholica tam admirandis passibus progrediens, sacerdotum discordiis, fastigiumque suum vestro excedente Episcopo, convellatur. Omittere autem non debeo, filii mei carissimi, unum alterumve ex clericis vestris, quantum possum laudando extollere; quibus scilicet potior fuit vox dehortantis conscientiae quam sociorum suorum impellentium cohortatio. Imo, non reticendi et alii; quinas enim aut senas literas a piis sacerdotibus accepi, in quibus fidem mihi faciunt officii sui, multa asseveratione scribentes se praeoptaturos fuisse sibi amputari manus, quam auctoribus talis hujus tumultus, (sic enim rem vocitant) nomina eorum signando adnumerari. Illustres animae! Dici non potest, quam incredibiliter exhiliratus fuerim, in tanto signantium numero, hac eorum, in deformi opere abnuendo, constantia. Salutate mihi eos omnes, idque sigillatim; adnectite quoque meo nomine, magno eis honore esse, quod ita *viva voce* solicitati a sociis quamplurimis, et voluntati Episcopi alacri vultu elicientis invitati, robore tamen animi invicto, et nobili pervicacia, omnem contagionem culpae, repudiaverint. Crediderim quoque, filii mei carissimi, nonnul-

los etiam ex vobis, socordia tantummodo peccasse, non malitia; eo quod scriptum, natura ejus non satis introspecta, incautius ac festinantius, quam meditatius, approbatione vestra confirmaveritis. Persuasissimum autem habeo, paucos saltem ex iis, quorum nomina ob pietatem mihi bene cognita inter signatores conspicio, codicillos istos quos ad me composuistis, ex animo aversaturos fuisse, si quid in iis esset dehonestamenti pro comperto habuissent.

APPENDIX H.

PUGIN AND ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE.

THE following address of the students of St. Edmund's was published in Ferrey's *Recollections of Pugin*, p. 137. Pugin's answer was printed in the *History of St. Edmund's College*, p. 249. As they have never been printed together, it has seemed worth while to give them here.

(1) ADDRESS TO MR. AUGUSTUS WELBY PUGIN.

ST. EDMUND'S COLLEGE, NEAR WARE, HERTS.

DEAR AND RESPECTED SIR,

Feeling ourselves highly honoured by your presence amongst us, long anxiously expected, we hasten to present you with a testimonial of our sentiments. While others more favoured have lived in the very circle of your actions, we, in our retirement, have communed with you solely in your writings. But think not that therefore our esteem has been less enthusiastic. We have watched your constant exertions in the revival of the real glory of art; we have witnessed your successful labours for the beautifying of the house of God, and great has been our respect, heartfelt our gratitude. A time has at length arrived when these feelings, so long secret, may be made manifest, and we rejoice in the hope that this small manifestation will give some passing satisfaction to you as highly deserving. The approving voice of many truly learned has already gone forth to cheer you in your career of utility and fame. And amongst these may we not number several of our own body, several amongst the anointed of God? They have been happy in their appointment to raise the broken altars of Israel—they have been further happy in having one who might render the beauties of these altars a fitting throne for the Eternal. In this twofold honour may we be one day their successors, and may we too have the advantage of your co-operation. That for many years your mind may be guided by the Framer of all beauty, that you may long continue the worthy embellisher of His temples, is the united earnest prayer of

THE STUDENTS OF ST. EDMUND'S.

(2) REPLY OF MR. PUGIN.

LONDON, *Feast of St. Francis Xavier*, 1842.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,

The shortness of my stay at St. Edmund's College having prevented me from making a suitable acknowledgment to the kind

Address you have presented to me, I take an early opportunity of expressing the great satisfaction which I have received from this unexpected testimony of your kind feelings towards me, not so much on personal grounds, but as the evidence of your views respecting the great revival of Catholic Art. You may be assured, my dear Friends, that it is the bounden duty of all Catholics throughout the world, but especially in our native land, to forward with all possible energy the restoration of Christian Architecture. It is not a mere question of taste, or of abstract beauty and proportion, but it has far higher claims on our veneration as the symbolism of the ancient faith. Viewed in this, its true light, ecclesiastical architecture cannot fail to receive from those who are destined to the sacred function of the priesthood that consideration which it deserves. From you, therefore, who will at some future period minister at these very altars which are now erecting under the sanction of your respected Bishop (at St. George's and other churches), this testimony of the feelings you entertain on this important subject is most gratifying to me.

There is but one sentence in the whole Address which did not afford me sincere pleasure. I allude to the epithet of fame referring to my labours. This savours of paganism. Architectural fame belongs rather to the Colosseum than the Cathedral. It would be a fearful and presumptuous attempt in any man to exalt himself by means of the temples of God. It is a privilege and a blessing to work in the sanctuary. The majesty of the vast churches of antiquity is owing to the sublime mysteries of the Christian Faith and the solemnity of its rites.

The ancient builders felt this. They knew the small share they could claim in the glories they produced, and their humility exceeded their skill. How unbecoming would it be, then, for any man at the present time to exult where works are after all but faint copies of ancient excellence. God has certainly permitted me to become an instrument in drawing attention to long forgotten principles, but the merit of these belongs to older and better days. I still enter even the humblest erections of Catholic antiquity as a disciple to the school of his master, and for all that is produced we must cry in most bounden duty, "Non nobis, Domine, non nobis, sed nomini tuo da gloriam".

Recommending myself to your prayers, and exhorting you to take every opportunity of informing yourselves in Catholic Art,

I remain,

Your devoted friend,

A. Welby Pugin.

APPENDIX J.

THE BLUNDELL LEGACY.

(1) Brief Statement of Facts.

Mr. Charles Robert Blundell of Ince Hall, Lancashire, died on October 20, 1837. His will was dated November 28, 1834. By this he left £5,000 to Bishop Walsh, in trust for Oscott College; £4,000 to Rev. T. G. Robinson, in trust for St. Edmund's College; £15,000 to the same Rev. T. G. Robinson, in trust for the clergy living in or near London; and the residue in equal proportions to Dr. Walsh and Dr. Bramston. Both Dr. Bramston and Rev. T. G. Robinson pre-deceased the testator, so that legally Dr. Walsh became entitled to the whole residue (which proved to be over £200,000), subject only to the obligation to apply £5,000 to the benefit of Oscott College. The will was disputed by the next-of-kin, on the plea that the money was clearly not intended for Dr. Walsh's personal use; and hence the testator must have intended to leave instructions as to its disposal. As he did not do so (they contended) Dr. Walsh must be regarded as trustee for the next-of-kin. Eventually, on March 3, 1839, a compromise was agreed to whereby all the charitable legacies were to be paid, whether or not the trustees were surviving, and in addition to this Dr. Walsh was to receive £70,400 in lieu of the residue.

The question was then raised whether Dr. Griffiths ought to receive the portion destined for Dr. Bramston, whom he had succeeded, as the money was clearly not intended for the Bishop's personal use, but for the good of religion in the diocese. At first Dr. Walsh took this view, and announced his intention of handing over the amount to Dr. Griffiths. Afterwards, however, in view of fresh knowledge, he changed his opinion and declared in the opposite sense. This led to controversy which was eventually referred to arbitration.

(2) Extract from Letter from Bishop Griffiths to Rev. C. Baggs, Episcopal Agent at Rome, dated March 24, 1841, giving his Side of the Case.

Mr. Blundell by his will made in November, 1834, left the residue of his property to Bishop Bramston and Bishop Walsh, of which you have a copy. From his notes written about the same time—from

the other pious bequests in his will—from his slight personal acquaintance with the Bishops—from his letter to Bishop Bramston on the same day—from the acknowledgment of Bishop Walsh (see his letter of November, 1837), this residue was left to the Districts, not to the Prelates themselves. Bishop Walsh considered Bishop Griffiths as a co-heir to this residue.

Bishop Bramston died in July, 1836; Mr. Blundell had a knowledge of the death of Bishop Bramston and seems to have contemplated a different disposal of his property, from his conversations and his dictated preparations for a new will or codicil. Mr. Blundell died in October, 1837, having made no change in his will of 1834. Of these circumstances Bishop Walsh and Bishop Griffiths were equally cognisant.

In order to avoid litigation with the relatives of Mr. Blundell, Bishop Walsh, with the consent and concurrence of Bishop Griffiths, made a compromise with the relatives, agreeing to receive £70,400, about one-third of the residue.

When this compromise had been legally signed, Bishop Walsh, to avoid further misunderstanding and disputes, entered into an agreement with Bishop Griffiths. Bishop Walsh proposed that the London and Midland Districts should equally profit by the will of Mr. Blundell. By the will Bishop Walsh's Seminary would receive £5,000; Bishop Griffiths's Seminary only £4,000; the London Clergy £15,000; the Midland Clergy nothing. Bishop Walsh therefore proposed that Bishop Griffiths should receive £14,000 less of the residue than himself, thus equalising the benefits to the two districts. This proposed agreement was communicated in the first instance to Mr. Lynch, as a friend of both, and was asked for as a favour by Bishop Walsh.

To this agreement Bishop Griffiths consented, considering that Bishop Walsh was the legal claimant, and that a doubt might be raised respecting the mind of Mr. Blundell subsequent to the death of Bishop Bramston. No deed was deemed necessary to secure the fulfilment of this agreement; but to guard against the contingency of Bishop Walsh's death, it was communicated by Bishop Walsh to his confidential solicitor, with instructions to see it executed in the event of his death. Bishop Walsh's solicitor as counsel informed Bishop Griffiths of his having these instructions. Bishop Walsh's letter of 19 May, 1839, distinctly confirms this agreement.

This was my situation for three years, from October, 1837, to October, 1840. I have borrowed money, and am engaged in affairs which will require more money. A convent has been built in London; land purchased in several places for chapels and schools; chapels and schools commenced in anticipation of this legacy.

In October, 1840, Bishop Walsh first informed me that he would not keep his agreement: you have this letter, and will observe that he justifies himself on the ground that Mr. Blundell intended to execute another will. I immediately answered him that a purpose or intention of changing a bequest did not affect the bequest. By referring to his letter of November, 1837, you will find that he has anticipated and answered his own objection. Besides, supposing this objection to have been sufficient to have prevented his making the agreement with me, it is not now sufficient to justify his violation of it now it has been acted on for three years. By the new will which Mr. Blundell proposed to make he appears from the paper to which Bishop Walsh alludes to have omitted the London District; but Bishop Walsh should have added that only £8,000 would have been left to himself. In consistency Bishop Walsh should totally reject or totally admit the paper. But in justice, honour, and conscience it has no weight.

As the legacy was about to be paid, and all my endeavours by letters and an interview to induce Bishop Walsh to change his mind were ineffectual, I wrote to the Executor of Mr. Blundell's will, requesting him not to pay Bishop Walsh until Bishop Walsh had engaged to fulfil his agreement with me.

Bishop Walsh's solicitor informed me, without any previous notice from the Bishop himself, that a bill was filed against me in Chancery. I prepared my legal answer, but instead of filing it in the Chancery Court, as the law requires, I sent it to Bishop Walsh, in order that his advisers might see from its contents and proofs that Bishop Walsh's character would be seriously compromised in the eyes of the public if I were to file the bill.

Bishop Walsh was thus induced to wish for a private arbitration. I have consented.

(3) EXTRACTS FROM BISHOP WALSH'S PAMPHLET, DRAWN UP BY HENRY BAGSHAWE, GIVING HIS SIDE OF THE CASE.

On the 28th November, 1834, Mr. Blundell executed his will. By it he gave £5,000 to Dr. Walsh, in trust for St. Mary's College, Oscott; £4,000 to Mr. Robinson, in trust for St. Edmund's College; and £15,000 to Mr. Robinson, to be applied at his discretion for Roman Catholic priests in and near London; and he gave the residue of his personal property "to the Right Rev. Dr. Bramston of London, and the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, their executors, administrators or assigns absolutely".

In 1836 Dr. Bramston died; and early in 1837 Mr. Robinson

died; and Mr. Blundell knew of both their deaths, and knew that Dr. Griffiths succeeded Dr. Bramston as Vicar Apostolic.

Mr. Blundell died on 30th October, 1837. . . .

On the 15th of November, 1837, Dr. Walsh was wholly ignorant that anything had ever passed through the mind of Mr. Blundell after he knew of the death of Dr. Bramston, as to the parties who in the events that had happened would receive the residue, or that Mr. Blundell was in the least aware that the legal consequences of Dr. Bramston's death were to transfer the whole of the residue to Dr. Walsh, or that Mr. Blundell's attention had been called to the largeness of the sum which Dr. Walsh would thus receive, or that knowing all this, he prepared notes of instruction for a new will, directing the omission of the names of Dr. Bramston and Mr. Robinson, and inserting the name of Dr. Walsh alone as residuary legatee, or that when he abandoned the idea of acting on these instructions, he did so with a specific intention that the former will should stand, but that Dr. Walsh should be *morally*, as he was *legally*, the sole residuary legatee—all these facts which subsequently came to Dr. Walsh's knowledge were unknown to him on the 15th November, 1837.

On the 15th of November, 1837, Dr. Walsh wrote to Dr. Griffiths a letter in which the following passage occurs: "As you, my dear Lord, are interested as well as myself, for you cannot for a moment suppose I would act otherwise than as if Dr. Bramston were alive as to the division of the residue. . . ."

. . . Dr. Walsh was aware that many Divines, and in particular Dr. Bramston, held the opinion that it was lawful to take whatever the law gives; but in the then state of his knowledge of the facts, and of his idea of his rights, he thought he was acting on the *safer* side to acknowledge the *moral* right of Dr. Griffiths to succeed to the moiety of the residue which Dr. Bramston would have taken if he had survived the testator; but if Dr. Walsh at that time had known the facts which he subsequently became aware of, he would never have recognised any such moral right to exist. . . .

Pending this negotiation, and while Dr. Walsh remained in ignorance of the several incidents which he subsequently discovered, as to the circumstances which occurred between the date of the will and the death of Mr. Blundell, Dr. Walsh suggested to Dr. Griffiths . . . that as the London Clergy would get £15,000 of Mr. Blundell's property, it was reasonable that £15,000 should be taken out of the residue before the intended division of it should be made, and that this £15,000 should be taken by Dr. Walsh, and that the remainder only should be equally divided between Dr. Walsh and Dr. Griffiths. To this proposal Dr. Griffiths assented; but afterwards Dr. Walsh,

thinking that the sums to be received by Dr. Walsh and Dr. Griffiths and their respective Colleges should be exactly equal, proposed to reduce the £15,000 to be taken by him to £14,000, so as to compensate the difference of £1,000 in the amount of the two legacies to the two Colleges. This proposal was also acceded to by Dr. Griffiths. The offer contained in Dr. Walsh's letter of the 15th November, 1837, and subsequently modified as last mentioned, constitutes what is called the agreement, the validity of which was afterwards submitted to arbitration. . . .

In and after the month of September, 1840, Dr. Walsh for the first time became aware of the following circumstances. (1) That in a Chancery suit (Blundell *v.* Gladstone . . .) many witnesses were examined on the part of Mr. Weld Blundell, and were cross-examined by the heirs-at-law (who were part of the next-of-kin); and that two of these witnesses were Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Smith—that Mr. Gladstone in his evidence stated "that in 1836 and 1837 he had many communications with Mr. Blundell as to his will—that he understood from Mr. Blundell that the residuary interest in his personal estate would amount to a considerable sum—that one of the residuary legatees, Dr. Bramston, was dead—that Mr. Gladstone asked Mr. Blundell if he had considered that in consequence the whole of his residuary personal property would go to Dr. Walsh?—that Mr. Gladstone's impression from what Mr. Blundell told him was that the residue would be £60,000 or £80,000—that he replied as if under the influence of surprise, "God bless me, I did not mean to give them more than £3,000 or £4,000 each"—that Mr. Gladstone replied, "then the will will require further consideration from you," and the conversation ended there.

In September, 1840, Dr. Walsh heard for the first time that Mr. Smith had given evidence as a witness in the same suit, to the effect that he was the incumbent priest of Formby, which was two or three miles from Ince—that he was on terms of great intimacy with Mr. Blundell, and had frequent conversations with him on the subject of altering his will—that Mr. Blundell stated to him *that by the deaths of Dr. Bramston and Mr. Robinson, and other persons, the money that would have gone to them would go to the residuary legatee, Dr. Walsh*—that he did not intend so large a sum to go *in one channel*—that he was dissatisfied with the will because all the money would fall into the hands of Dr. Walsh—that Mr. Smith collected that he meant to reduce this large amount by giving a considerable sum out of it to Mr. Stonor—that in May or June, 1837, Mr. Smith took down notes which he corrected, changed, and obliterated at the dictation of Mr. Blundell and which were intended to serve as instructions for a will

which he, Mr. Blundell, had intended to prepare—that these notes were contained in several papers which were produced by Mr. Smith—that one of these papers was the general outline of a will . . . that these notes were canvassed over and over again between the late Mr. Blundell and Mr. Smith up to about six weeks before his death—that they remained in Mr. Blundell's hands up to ten days before his death, when he sent them over by a groom to Mr. Smith, accompanied by a letter in which after referring to them, he invited Mr. Smith to visit him on the subject—that they remained in Mr. Smith's hands up to Mr. Blundell's death. . . .

Under these circumstances Dr. Walsh considered that he ought not to be held bound by the understanding he had come to with Dr. Griffiths in ignorance of what Dr. Walsh considered as very material facts, inasmuch as he was perfectly satisfied that he never would, or indeed could, have come to any such understanding if he had known the real state of the case.

Accordingly in October, 1840, Dr. Walsh informed Dr. Griffiths of his discovery of Mr. Smith's evidence (for that of Mr. Gladstone he was aware of only at a later period) and stated his intention not to carry out the arrangement, but proposed as some compensation to Dr. Griffiths to pay him £3,000 out of his own private funds.

Dr. Griffiths[1] however considered the arrangement binding, and stated his intention to enforce it by legal means, if necessary; he intimated that he considered the evidence of Mr. Smith as entitled to no weight, in consequence of the state of his mind; he however at the same time stated that a case for relieving Dr. Walsh might arise in the event of its appearing that Dr. Walsh had acted *in substantial error*. Accordingly Dr. Griffiths caused a bill in Chancery to be prepared for the purpose of compelling Dr. Walsh by law to perform the agreement. But proceedings before a public tribunal were not only objectionable in themselves, they were prohibited by the Holy See; and the matters in dispute were eventually referred to the award of the Right Rev. Drs. Kyle and Murdoch, the Rev. Dr. Youens, and the Rev. Messrs. Sharples and Sherburne.

(4) Award of the Arbitrators.

We the undersigned Right Reverend Doctor James Kyle, Right Reverend Doctor John Murdoch, Reverend Doctor Thomas Youens,

[1] This paragraph Dr. Griffiths complained of as a total mis-statement. It is noticeable that in his answer Dr. Walsh did not defend its accuracy, but told Dr. Griffiths that only a few persons had seen the pamphlet, and exhorted him to exercise humility, etc. (see his letters in the Griffith Letter Book in the *Westminster Archives*).

Reverend James Sharples and Reverend Thomas Sherburne, duly nominated and appointed Arbitrators to settle all matters in difference between the Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Griffiths and the Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Walsh as to the Blundell bequest and as to any agreement or understanding stated to have been entered into or come to between them respecting the bequest, and also as to all costs relating to any of such matters or to the present Arbitration, having fully considered the statements made, the evidence adduced and the arguments urged by counsel on both sides, have unanimously determined and hereby make and declare our award on these matters as follows: namely, we award that besides the sums bequeathed by the late Charles Robert Blundell of Ince, for the benefit of Old Hall Green College, and the Clergy in and about London, the said Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Walsh shall out of the sum of seventy thousand four hundred pounds secured to him by a compromise between him and the next of kin of the said Charles Robert Blundell concluded on the 4th day of March, 1839, pay to the said Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Griffiths the sum of Twenty-eight thousand two hundred pounds, with interest thereon at the rate of four per cent. per annum, from the first day of December eighteen hundred and thirty-eight down to the day of payment, and that this payment shall be made within one calendar month after the executor of the said Charles Robert Blundell shall have paid the residue of the personal property of Charles Robert Blundell aforesaid; that further we award that the said parties, the Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Griffiths and the Right Reverend Doctor Thomas Walsh shall each pay his own costs, and a just and equal moiety of the costs of this Arbitration. In witness whereof we have signed these presents at London on this twenty-fourth day of August eighteen hundred and forty-one.

\+ James Kyle.
\+ John Murdoch.
Thomas Youens.
James Sharples.
Thomas Sherburne.

As the result of some correspondence with Dr. Walsh and Mr. Bagshawe on the day that the award was issued, the Arbitrators added the following note the next day:—

The Arbitrators before drawing up their award, had come to the resolution, on grounds that seemed to them just and necessary, not to express in that award the reasonings that led them to give it; and now having again fully deliberated on the matter, they continue to think that it is highly expedient to adhere to that resolution.

(The next two paragraphs concern certain details as to the distribution of the costs between the parties.)

The Arbitrators further consider it due to all parties to declare that in the course of their investigations on this Arbitration nothing has come before them that can impeach in the slightest degree the honour or moral integrity of anyone connected with this dispute; and with respect to the Right Reverend Prelate, against whose claims they have felt it their duty to give their award, they cannot in too strong terms express their deep sense of his high moral character, and of his strict adhesion to whatever he conscientiously believes to be just and true.

+ James Kyle.
+ John Murdoch.
Thomas Youens.
James Sharples.
Thomas Sherburne.

Green's Hotel, Lincoln's Inn Fields,
August 25th, 1841.

(5) Letter from the Arbitrators to Dr. Walsh.

The Arbitrators present their respectful compliments to the Right Reverend Doctor Walsh, and have great pleasure in declaring unanimously that the importance attached by his Lordship to the evidence brought before them in the case between himself and Doctor Griffiths, and particularly to the evidence of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Smith, justified his Lordship in instituting this enquiry, though they do not agree with his Lordship in considering that it affords sufficient grounds to exonerate him from the fulfilment of his agreement with Doctor Griffiths.

Green's Hotel, Lincoln's Inn Fields,
August 25th, 1841.

APPENDIX K.

THE PASTORAL OF BISHOP BAINES.

(1) Declaration Presented to his Holiness by Bishop Baines on March 15, 1841.

First, I engaged publicly to declare, as I now do, that I never intended in any way to allude in the Pastoral to the decrees of Propaganda of the 29th of September, 1838, which decrees as explained by Propaganda, I fully receive, and consider as the conscientious rule of my conduct. As to ridiculing those who patronise or observe them, I should think it wrong to do so, and certainly never intended to do it.

Secondly, I engaged to declare that in no part of the Pastoral did I mean to disapprove of the *Devotion to the Sacred Heart*, as far as it has had the approbation of the Holy See. If I alluded to the subject at all, it was only to disapprove of certain inaccurate expressions contained in books which the Holy See has never approved, or of the imprudent way in which the devotion is sometimes practised or brought forward. As to the doctrine of the *Immaculate Conception*, all I alluded to in the Pastoral was the making dedications to it of books which were liable to fall into the hands of Protestants, to whom I considered that such dedications were more likely to give scandal than edification. On these, as well as all other doctrines and practices, I do and always have approved whatever the Church, or its organ the Holy See, approves.

Thirdly, I promised to declare that I did not in the Pastoral disapprove of *prayers in general* for the Conversion of England, some of which I ordered, much less did I disapprove of any particular prayers which the Holy See had approved; that the only prayers I prohibited in the Pastoral, as expressly stated in my answers to the charges, was a weekly Mass proposed to be celebrated publicly for the immediate national Conversion of England. I have no hesitation in adding, however, that should the Holy See approve or command such Mass, I should certainly approve and enforce it.

Fourthly, I said the same of pious associations and pious exercises of all kinds. It undoubtedly belongs to the Holy See to sanc-

tion such matters by its authority, and it is undoubtedly my duty as a Bishop and Vicar Apostolic to obey its regulations.

Fifthly, I have already said, and here again openly declare, that I had no intention of applying the remarks I made in the Pastoral respecting converts *to the whole body of them in general*, but only to certain individuals who were animated by a zeal which appeared to me imprudent, and calculated to injure rather than benefit religion. In applying to them certain texts from the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians and Timothy, I never meant to insinuate that those converts were guilty of the same offences as are mentioned by St. Paul, or to impeach in any way either their faith, their morality, or their good intentions.

In objecting to the term "heretics" being applied indiscriminately to Protestants, I declared that I did not mean to deny that the term may be applied in a correct theological sense to any sect which denies the articles of the Catholic Faith, and is separated from the centre of Catholic Unity, but only to assert that some individuals who err invincibly and without obstinacy, are not heretics in the strict and formal sense of the term, and that harsh appellations, however true, ought to be refrained from, as more likely to repel men from the Faith than to allure them to it.

As to the charge of wishing to flatter Protestants, I referred to the passage of the Pastoral in which I compare the Anglican clergy to the Pagan priesthood, in proof that such charge is groundless. And as to the complaint that I had seemed to place myself in opposition to the Holy See, I could only regret if this had happened through any fault of mine, it having ever been my intention, as it was undoubtedly my duty, to show every deference, respect, and obedience to that supreme authority.

(2) Letter from Pope Gregory XVI. to Bishop Baines, in Answer to the Above.

(Translation Published by Bishop Baines.)

To our Venerable Brother, Peter Augustine Baines, Bishop of Siga, and Vicar Apostolic in the Western District of England.

Venerable Brother,

The injunction, Venerable Brother, which with paternal charity we addressed to you in our letter of the 16th of January of the current year, and with which your docility, religion, and deference to the Holy See caused us to anticipate your compliance, we exceedingly

rejoice in the Lord, and cordially congratulate with you that you have faithfully fulfilled. For the written declaration of the 1st instant which you delivered to us in person, respecting the Pastoral put forth by you on the 24th of February of the past year, satisfies, we find, both the decision of the select Committee and our own exhortations, and therefore we most willingly admit it, not doubting that what you promise, you will seasonably fulfil.

Go on, therefore, Venerable Brother, to preserve the bond of sacerdotal concord and unity of spirit with your colleagues, the Vicars Apostolic and other Pastors of souls, and remember the saying of St. Leo, "that it is our duty and yours to establish by the grace of charity what by no insidious art of the devil may be overthrown". In the meantime, whilst we embrace you with fatherly affection, we most affectionately impart to you our Apostolical Benediction.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 19th of March, 1841.

GREGORY PP. XVI.

(3) EXTRACT FROM A LETTER FROM LORD CLIFFORD, DATED ROME, JUNE 5, 1841, AND PUBLISHED BY DR. BAINES IN HIS PAMPHLET.

By the words which the Holy Father repeated to me in the presence of Mr. and Mrs. H. Weld, their daughter Appolonia, and my son Henry, who can all as well as myself swear to the fact, his Holiness declared to me that *it was impossible to call upon you to retract any expression in your Lenten Pastoral of last year, because retractation could only be required where manifest error existed, and your Pastoral was not in his opinion liable to any such imputation.* If others on this point choose to think differently from the Pope, if they choose to make use of their station in the Catholic Church or in society to express their sentiments, in preference to those of the Pope, upon others, I leave them to answer for their conduct to God who is their judge, not I. But I certainly shall not adopt their sentiments.

His Holiness would never allow me in speaking of the declarations he might require, or had required from your Lordship, to make use of the word retractation or even explanation, in reference to what he required of your Lordship.

When I informed Cardinal Giustiniani, after I had seen Monsignor Cadolini, and before I had seen his Holiness, of what you had told me, the answer of his Eminence was very different from that of the Most Reverend Secretary of Propaganda, but yet not near as satisfactory to me as the answer of his Holiness. His Eminence told me that you were perfectly right in saying that his Holiness did not require of you any retractation, but only such declarations as would

preclude the possibility of hereafter affixing, unless injuriously to your Lordship and offensively to the Holy See, a meaning to several parts of it which his Holiness and the Sacred Congregation had been assured had been affixed to it.

I have also to acquaint your Lordship that I had yesterday a long conversation with Cardinal Mai on the subject of your last visit to Rome, and that the impression on his Eminence's mind is that your Lordship reported to me perfectly correctly the sentiments of his Holiness as to the retractation of any part of your Lordship's Lenten Pastoral of last year.

(4) Letter of Pope Gregory XVI. to each of the English Vicars Apostolic, dated December, 6, 1841.

Venerabilis Frater, Salutem et Apostolicam Benedictionem.

Praesentibus annexa litteris tria excipies documenta; Epistolam videlicet nostram (A) qua judicium protulimus circa Pastorales Litteras Venerabilis Fratris Episcopi Sigensis, Vicarii Apostolici in Occidentali Angliae districtu; responsum quod ab ipso primum nobis datum est (B); ac demum ultiores litteras, queis eum Romae degentem serio admonuimus, ut ad saniora consilia se recipiat (C); quibus acceptis obtulit nobis declarationem sub die 15 Martii, quam jam tibi transmisimus, quamque eo libentius accepimus quo magis sincero conscriptam animo arbitrabamur. Porro nos praefati Antistitis honori fere plus quam nostro consulentes quae inter illum ac nos contigerant patefacere noluimus, rati eum benignitate hac nostra non abusurum, contraria factis venditando. Eisdem itaque quibus illum exceperamus, paternae dilectionis et charitatis significationibus pariter et dimisimus; ac ne quid Nostrae erga illum indulgentiae ac liberalitatis deesse videretur, propriis etiam sumptibus ei suppeditanda curavimus, quae ad ipsius dignitatem et commodum pertinere existimabamus. Nec sane ab hac Sancta Sede atque a Congregatione Propagandae Fidei majores humanitatis demonstrationes expectare unquam potuisset.

Quandoquidem vero Sigensis Episcopus quin clementiae Nostrae ut par fuisset, responderet, novos libellos evulgavit, queis facta fere omnia invertit, atque unam referens Epistolam Nostram, datam die 19 Martii post emissam a se declarationem, caetera quae praecesserunt praetermisit, tum demum veluti triumphum agens, suis conatus est persuadere, Litteras Pastorales, de quibus agitur, a se exaratas, tanquam ab omni erroris labe ac suspicione immunes nullàque censura dignas habitas esse; Nos propterea muneri Nostro *illud*, omnino

illud, debere sentimus, ut jactationem hujusmodi et falsitatem, ex quâ maximum Apostolicae Sedi ac Christianae Religioni dedecus oriri posset, adversus veritatem praevalere nequaquam sinamus. Quamobrem praedicta documenta ad Fraternitatem Tuam, sicuti et ad caeteros Collegas Tuos Apostolicos Angliae Vicarios, mittere decrevimus, ut rem totam plene compertam habeas, atque simul pro Tua Sapientiâ id consilii capere valeas, unde et omne scandalum caute admodum praecaveatur, et quid hâc in re sentiendum sit, ii omnes, quibus haec ignorare perniciosum accideret, opportune et prudenter edoceantur.

Interea Tibi, Venerabilis Frater, Apostolicam Benedictionem peramanter impertimur.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum Die sexta Decembris MDCCCXLI. Pontificatus Nostri anno undecimo.

GREGORIUS PP. XVI.

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF EVENTS IN VOL. I.

1829.	April 13.	Catholic Emancipation becomes law.
	Sept. 14.	Bishop Baines arrives in England from Rome as Vicar Apostolic of the Western District.
	Oct. 1.	Interview between Bishop Baines and the Downside authorities at Bathampton on the status of the English Benedictines, and the proposal to make Downside a diocesan seminary.
	Nov. 8.	Bishop Baines withdraws the faculties of the Downside Benedictines. They appeal to Rome, and depute Dom Richard Marsh and Dom Joseph Brown to proceed there.
	Nov. 20-24.	Meeting of Vicars Apostolic at Wolverhampton. Bishop Walsh undertakes to endeavour to make peace between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines. Bishop Baines proceeds to Ampleforth for the winter.
		Prior Park property purchased by Bishop Baines for diocesan seminary.
1830.	Mar. 15.	Bishop Weld is created Cardinal.
	April.	The Sanatory Decree issued by Propaganda on March 13, regularising the position of the Benedictines and secularising the three Ampleforth superiors, having arrived, these superiors with many of the boys leave for Prior Park.
	June 26.	Death of George IV.
		Accession of William IV.
	Nov.	Fall of the Duke of Wellington's Government.
	Dec. 1.	Death of Pope Pius VIII.
1831.	Feb. 2.	Cardinal Capellari elected Pope. He takes the name of Gregory XVI.
	July 30.	Death of Bishop Smith. Bishop Penswick succeeds as Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District.

1831.	Dec.	Bishop Bramston is deputed by Rome to inquire into the case between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines and to report.
1832.	Jan. 19.	Bishop Bramston's terms having been refused by President Birdsall, he declines to concern himself further in the matter, and reports to Rome accordingly.
	June 2.	Death of Charles Butler.
	June 7.	Reform Act receives Royal Assent.
	Sept.	Dr. Wiseman arrives in England to arbitrate between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines. He is unsuccessful and returns to Rome before the end of the year.
1833.	Jan. 13.	Dr. Briggs, President of Ushaw, is appointed Coadjutor in the Northern District.
	Feb. 25.	Thomas Chisholm Anstey received into the Church.
		Henry Bagshawe received into the Church.
	Mar. 15.	Death of Bishop Gradwell.
	April.	Newman and H. Froude call on Dr. Wiseman in Rome.
	June 29.	Consecration of Bishop Briggs at Ushaw.
	July 14.	Dr. Griffiths, President of St. Edmund's College, appointed Coadjutor in the London District.
	Oct. 28.	Consecration of Bishop Griffiths at St. Edmund's College.
1834.	Feb. 25.	Death of Rev. Sir Henry Trelawny.
	Feb. 27.	Bishop Baines arrives in Rome to conduct his case against the Benedictines, etc.
	May 12.	At a special Congregation, Propaganda settles on Arbitration Court to try the case between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines. His application for Dr. Wiseman as his Coadjutor is *dilata*.
		Conversion of Augustus Welby Pugin.
	Dec.	Bishop Baines arrives back at Prior Park.
	Dec. 10.	Joint letter of the English and Scotch Vicars Apostolic to the Pope.
1835.		Building of new college at Oscott begun, under the direction of Dr. Weedall, President. The architect is Mr. Potter, of Lichfield.
		Monastic life begun by Trappists at Mount St.

		Bernard's, in Charnwood Forest, the land being given by Mr. Lisle Phillipps.
1835.	April.	Lord Melbourne's Government takes office.
	June 16.	Dr. Gentili arrives in England, and proceeds to Trelawny Castle, Cornwall.
	June 20.	Letter from Pope Gregory XVI. to the Vicars Apostolic in answer to theirs.
	July 9.	Arbitration between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines opens at Clifton.
	July 14.	Dr. Wiseman arrives in London.
	Aug. 1.	Dr. Gentili installed at Prior Park.
	Aug. 22.	The findings of the arbiters between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines issued.
	Aug.	Dr. Wiseman visits Prior Park, but fails to come to an agreement with Bishop Baines, and goes for a tour through England.
	Dec. 10.	The findings of the arbiters between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines confirmed by Rome.
	Dec.	Dr. Wiseman's first course of lectures at Lincoln's Inn Fields Chapel.
1836.	Jan. 28.	Death of Bishop Penswick. Bishop Briggs succeeds as Vicar Apostolic of the Northern District.
	Feb. 9.	Opening of new church at St. John's Wood.
	Lent.	Dr. Wiseman's second course of lectures, at Moorfields Church.
	May.	First number of *Dublin Review* appears.
	May 30.	Great fire at Prior Park.
	July 11.	Death of Bishop Bramston. Bishop Griffiths succeeds as Vicar Apostolic of the London District.
	Sept.	Dr. Wiseman leaves England on his return to Rome.
		Pugin's *Contrasts* published.
		Marriage Act passed.
1837.	Jan.	Mgr. Acton named *Uditore della Camera.*
	Jan. 25.	Meeting of Vicars Apostolic at York. They decide to consider the Hierarchy question the following year.
		Petition from the Northern Clergy as to ecclesiastical government of England sent to Rome.
	April 10.	Death of Cardinal Weld.

1837.	April 13.	Bishops Walsh and Griffiths leave London for Rome on the Hierarchy question.
	May 13.	The Bishops arrive in Rome. The Pope, advised by Mgr. Acton, says he is willing that they should become Ordinaries in everything but in name, and asks that the English Bishops should submit a scheme.
	June 20.	Death of William IV. Accession of Queen Victoria.
	July 12.	The two Bishops leave Rome on their return to England.
	Oct. 11.	New Monastic Chapel at Mount St. Bernard's opened.
	Oct. 30.	Charles Blundell, of Ince Hall, dies, leaving a large bequest to the Church, which results in a long contest between Dr. Griffiths and Dr. Walsh.
1838.	Mar. 1.	Catholic Institute established.
	April.	The Bishops at their Low Week meeting at York draw out *Statuta Provisoria* for the English mission, to be submitted to Rome.
	May 31.	Opening of the College Chapel at New Oscott.
	Aug. 1.	New College at Oscott opened.
	Aug. 10.	Dr. Newsham proposes a scheme for Dr. Wiseman to live in England and preach missions and retreats.
	Sept. 29.	Two decrees in favour of Regulars issued by Propaganda.
	Oct.	*Statuta Proposita* for the English mission drawn out in Rome, under the influence of Mgr. Acton, sent to the Bishops for comments.
	Nov.	Meeting of Bishops in London to consider these two questions.
		Association for the Conversion of England established in Paris by Rev. George Spencer.
	Dec. 22.	Frederick Lucas received into the Church by Father Lythgoe, S.J.
1839.	April 8.	Meeting of Vicars Apostolic at Prior Park. They find fault with the conduct of Dr. Wiseman as their agent.
	May.	Association for the Propaganda of the Faith established in England.

1839.	June 6.	First annual meeting of the Catholic Institute.
	Sept. 5.	Formal decision of Propaganda as to the decrees about Regulars.
	Sept. 8.	Cardinal Fransoni writes announcing the subdivision of England into new Districts.
	Sept. 29.	Mrs. Pugin (Welby Pugin's second wife) received into the Church by Daniel Rock at Alton Towers.
	Oct. 9.	Opening of Pugin's Church, St. Marie's, Derby.
	Oct. 29.	Foundation-stone of St. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham, laid by Bishop Walsh; Pugin the architect.
1840.	Lent.	Bishop Baines issues a Pastoral criticising the action of certain converts.
	May 11.	England divided into eight Vicariates.
	May 16.	The first number of the *Tablet* is published, under the editorship of Frederick Lucas.
	May.	Bishop Baines summoned to Rome to defend his Pastoral, which is eventually condemned, and he writes an "explanation" of its meaning.
	June 8.	Dr. Wiseman consecrated at the English College, Rome, as Bishop Coadjutor in the Central District.
	July 3.	Briefs for the new Vicars Apostolic issued in Rome.

INDEX.

ACTON, Cardinal, i. 154, 155, 157, 158, 159, 163, 164, 166; ii. 122, 123, 127, 164, 166, 167, 173, 205.
Acton, Sir Ferdinand, i. 154.
Acton, Sir John, i. 154.
Adelphi, the, ii. 159, 290.
Alford, Dean, ii. 127, 128, 259.
Allies, T. W., ii. 127, 136.
Allies, Miss, ii. 236.
Altieri, Cardinal, ii. 214.
Alton Towers (formerly Abbey), i. 71, 102, 103, 104, 119 *seq.*, 136; ii. 199.
Amadeus, Father, ii. 23.
Amherst, Rev. William, i. 4; ii. 1.
Ampleforth, i. 16, 18, 20, 28, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 45, 70, 107, 157, 174, 176; ii. 18, 56.
Ampleforth Journal, i. 45, 70.
Andrews, W. E., i. 74, 195.
Anstey, T. Chisholm, conversion, i. 76 *seq.*, 146, 197, 203; secures repeal of Penal Laws, ii. 72 *seq.*, 163, 202.
Antonelli, Cardinal, ii. 224, 235.
Apostolicum Ministerium of Benedict XIV. (*Regula Missionis*), i. 7, 22, 122, 132, 133, 143, 144; ii. 165, 166, 291.
Arbiters (Bishop Baines and Benedictines), i. 37.
Arbiters (Blundell Legacy), i. 189.
Archer, Rev. James, i. 73.
Archives quoted:—
  Birmingham, i. 139, 151; ii. 9, 14, 245, 246, 250, 251, 254, 272.
  Clifton, i. 24, 35, 37, 44, 70, 135, 136, 156, 204; ii. 10, 56, 164.
  Downside, i. 34, 40, 46, 73, 138; ii. 161.
  Leeds, i. 27, 46.
  Oscott, ii. 201, 233.
  Rome (English College), i. 51, 63, 65, 140, 157; ii. 10.
  Southwark, ii. 63.
  Ushaw, i. 54, 55.
  Westminster, i. 14, 59, 62, 123, 127, 129, 148, 149, 155, 156, 187; ii. 29, 156, 201, 209, 213 *seq.*
  Westminster, Griffiths letter book, i. 143, 152, 156, 165, 171, 175, 176; ii. 47, 60, 96.
Armellini, ii. 235.
Arundel and Surrey, Earl of, speech on Education, ii. 50, 64, 81; letter to Archbishop McHale, 135, 137, 140, 158, 202, 253.
Arundell, Lord (of Wardour), ii. 78, 201.
Association of St. Thomas, ii. 54, 193, 199.
Aston Hall, ii. 12, 22.

BACCHUS, Henry, ii. 127.
Baggs, Bishop, i. 170, 171; ii. 121, 160.
Bagshawe, Henry, i. 67, 76, 146, 152, 190, 203, 216; ii. 178, 210, 257, 281.
Bagshawe, Edward (Archbishop), i. 67; ii. 257.
Bagshaw, John (Canon), i. 670.
Baines, Bishop, V.A. Western District, i. 12; description of, by Wiseman, 13, 14; disagreement with Benedictines, 15; unsuccessful scheme to make Downside his seminary, 16; or Ampleforth Community, 18; not invited to Benedictine Chapter, 19; absence in Rome, 20; presses Downside scheme, maintaining that it was not canonically established, 21; on death of Bishop Collingridge, he returns to England, 22; withdraws Downside faculties, 23; purchases Prior Park, 25; spends winter at Ampleforth, 26, 28; decision on Downside case, 30; Prior Park established by secularised monks and boys from Ampleforth, *ibid.*, 35, 36; dispute as to Bath mission, 37 *seq.*; Downside faculties restored, 39, 40; unsuccessful attempt at mediation by Wiseman, 41; dispute with Cannington nuns, 42 *seq.*; dispute as to Trenchard Street Church, Bristol, 44; goes to Rome, *ibid.*; applies unsuccessfully

for Wiseman as Coadjutor, 45; returns with instructions for arbitration, *ibid.*; Arbitration, 46 *seq.*, 54, 56; letter to Dr. Griffiths on Regulars, 59 *seq.*, 62, 68; receives Wiseman at Prior Park, 69; they fall out, 70, 71; fire at Prior Park, 79, 112, 123, 135, 143, 156; V.A. of New Western District, 166, 169, 174, 175, 176, 204; opposes Rev. G. Spencer and a section of the converts, 210 *seq.*; writes pastoral on subject, 213 *seq.*; summoned to Rome, 215; formal complaints against Pastoral, 216; his answer, 217; decision against him, *ibid.*; on his return he issues two pamphlets, *ibid.*; censured by Pope, 218; objects to Gothic Vestments, ii. 14; establishes Redemptorists, 24; last days and sudden death, 55 *seq.*, 160, 211.
Baldacconi, Rev. A., i. 71, 147.
Barber, Rev. F. L., i. 18, 22, 24.
Barnabò, Cardinal, ii. 165, 166, 213, 214, 215, 216, 220, 221, 281.
Bath Mission, dispute, i. 36; award, 49.
Beaumont, Lord, ii. 75, 76, 286.
Belisy, Rev. E., i. 68.
Bell, Rev. Andrew, ii. 146, 147.
Bergh, Abbot, ii. 181.
Berington, Rev. Joseph, ii. 237.
Bernard, Father, i. 33.
Beste, Rev. K. D., ii. 257.
Beste, Mr., ii. 243.
Birdsall, Rev. J. A., i. 20, 34 *seq.*, 40, 47 *seq.*
Birmingham, St. Chad's Cathedral, i. 110, 118; ii. 10, 11, 65, 234.
Birmingham, St. Peter's, i. 110; ii. 17.
Blundell Legacy, i. 187.
Bonomi, Rev. J., i. 45, 70.
Bourbon, Prince Henri de, ii. 8.
Bowden, Rev. John E., ii. 127.
Bowles, Rev. F., ii. 91, 115, 119, 175.
Bowyer, Sir George, ii. 129, 286.
Boyle, Rev. Richard, ii. 174.
Bradley, Dean, ii. 117.
Bramston, Bishop, resides at Golden Square, i. 12; question of his age settled, *ibid.*, 22, 36; refuses to arbitrate between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines, 40, 41, 43; at Dr. Gradwell's death, 51; obtains appointment of Dr. Griffiths as Coadjutor, 52, 53, 54, 55; opposes Jesuits as to St. John's Wood Church, 58 *seq.*, 64; appreciates Wiseman's Lectures, 73; death, 80, 122, 125, 173; connection with Blundell Legacy, 188; ii. 172.
Bridgett, Rev. Thomas, ii. 127.
Briggs, Bishop, elected on Arbitration board of Baines case, i. 45, 46, 48, 112; elected Bishop, 123, 125, 141, 144, 155; circulates the *Statuta Proposita*, 159; V.A. Yorkshire District, 166, 173, 204, 210; encourages mission by Dr. Gentili, ii. 25, 58; on platform at York meeting with Father Mathew, 62; assists Irish in Famine time, 135; protests against Lucas's attack on Langdale, 154; suggests Education Committee, 156, 164; opposed to Diplomatic Relations, 193; goes to Rome to oppose it, 196, 207, 219, 280, 282, 287, 290, 292.
Brindle, Rev. Thomas, i. 28, 36, 39, 136; ii. 57, 121.
Bristol, St. Mary-on-the-Quay, ii. 55, 57.
Bristol, Trenchard Street, i. 44, 49; ii. 55.
British Critic, ii. 89, 100, 109.
Brooke, Rev. C., i. 45, 48.
Brookfield, Rev. W. H., i. 171.
Brougham, Lord, ii. 64.
Brown, Bishop George, i. 164; ii. 215, 219, 292.
Brown, Bishop James, ii. 282.
Brown, Bishop T. J., i. 17, 19, 22, 23, 34, 46, 47, 48, 166; ii. 282, 292.
Brownlow, Bishop, ii. 127.
Burder, George, ii. 126.
Burgess, Rev. T. L., i. 25, 28, 31, 39, 42, 48; ii. 282.
Butland, Rev. B., ii. 127.
Butler, Rev. Alban, ii. 243, 246.
Butler, Charles, i. 75; ii. 237.
Butler, Rev. Peter, i. 180.
Butt, W., ii. 181.

Cadolini, Mgr., i. 135, 148.
Cahill, John (Bishop), ii. 181.
Calderbank, Rev. L., i. 30, 37.
Camoys, Lord, i. 198; ii. 15, 75.
Capellari, Cardinal, i. 11, 21, 22, 23, 25 *seq.*, 40. See also Pope Gregory XVI.
Capes, Rev. J. M., ii. 118, 238 *seq.*, 245.
Carrega, Mgr., i. 21.
Carter, John, i. 82.
Castracane, Cardinal, ii. 214.
Caswall, Rev. Edward, ii. 127.
Catholic, the, ii. 46.
Catholic Association, i. 195.
Catholic Board, i. 195.

Catholic Committee, i. 194; ii. 155.
Catholic Directory, i. 177; ii. 102, 117, 180, 181.
Catholic Institute, i. 195 *seq.*; ii. 49, 51, 52, 53, 76, 148, 151 *seq.*, 194.
Catholic Magazine, i. 3, 9, 42, 50, 51, 56, 74, 112, 113, 119, 185, 196; ii. 93, 95.
Catholic Poor School Committee, ii. 54, 157.
Catholic Spectator, i. 74.
Catholicon, i. 78.
Chad, St., Relics of, ii. 12, 13.
Challoner, Bishop, ii. 172.
Chapter, Benedictine, i. 19, 20.
Chapter, Secular, i. 55; ii. 290.
Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, ii. 223.
Cheadle, St. Giles's, ii. 126, 199.
Cheltenham, ii. 38.
Christie, Rev. Albany, ii. 126, 259.
Church, Dean, ii. 85.
Ciacchi, Cardinal, ii. 226.
Ciceroacchio, ii. 191, 235.
Cisalpine Club, i. 194.
Cistercian Order in England, i. 106.
Clanricarde, Lord, ii. 64.
Clifford, Lord, i. 63, 105, 146, 151, 156; ii. 52, 225.
Clifford, Hon. H., i. 5.
Coffin, Rev. R. A., ii. 121, 127.
Collingridge, Bishop, i. 20, 36.
Colonies, British, i. 145.
Confraternity of the Immaculate Heart of Mary, ii. 260.
Connolly, Rev. Pierce, ii. 181.
Connolly, Mrs., ii. 181.
Constable, Stephen, i. 198.
Convents, i. 181; ii. 180.
Coombes, Rev. W. H., i. 24, 25, 39.
Cooper, Rev. L., i. 35.
Costigan, Rev. T., i. 101.
Cotton Hall, ii. 126, 178, 199, 252, 254, 255.
Coux, de, Professor, i. 76.
Cox, Rev. Edward, i. 174; ii. 29, 120, 165, 168, 169.
Cox, Mr. (printer), ii. 39, 40, 41, 46.
Crook Hall, i. 52.
Curtis, Archbishop, i. 127.

Dale, Rev. H., ii. 126.
Dalgairns, Rev. J. D., ii. 108, 109, 115, 175.
Dawn of Catholic Revival, quoted, i. 55, 108; ii. 242.
Declaration, Royal, i. 198; Lingard's pamphlet, 199.
Denbigh, Lord, ii. 129.
Derby, St. Marie's, i. 98, 114, 115; ii. 234.
Devine, Rev. Pius, ii. 179.
Digby, Kenelm, ii. 243.
Diplomatic Relations Act, ii. 191 *seq.*, 209.
Dismore, Mr., ii. 40 *seq.*
Disraeli, B., ii. 104.
Döllinger, Dr., ii. 242.
Dolman's Magazine, ii. 115, 242, 245, 250, 251.
Dominic, Ven. Father, i. 140, 163; ii. 19, 22, 24, 26, 115, 178, 179.
Douay College, i. 15, 52; ii. 241.
Douglass, Bishop, ii. 172.
Downside, i. 16, 18, 39, 107; ii. 18, 19, 58, 240. See also Baines, Bishop.
Doyle, Rev. T. ("Father Thomas"), i. 118; ii. 64, 168, 174, 182.
Dublin Review, i. 75, 76, 199; ii. 42, 88, 95, 108, 114.
Durando, General, ii. 226.

Edinburgh Review, i. 75.
Education, Catholic and non-Catholic compared, ii. 238 *seq.* See also *Factory Act*, and *Catholic Poor School Committee*.
Egerton, Sir Francis, ii. 35.
Elphin, Bishop of, ii. 141, 144.
Emancipation Club, i. 194.
Emly, Lord, ii. 129.
Englefield, Sir Henry, ii. 237.
Errington, Rev. George (Archbishop), ii. 8.
Estcourt, Rev. Edgar, ii. 121.
Eve of Catholic Emancipation, quoted, i. 20, 44, 67, 195; ii. 74, 77.
Exeter, Bishop of, ii. 81.
Eyre, Lady Barbara, i. 181.
Eyston, F., i. 198.

Faber, Rev. F. W., joins Tractarians, ii. 87, 103; Vicar of Elton, 121; his travels, 122 *seq.*; writes *Sights and Thoughts in Foreign Churches*, 122; conversion, 124; founds Wilfridians in Birmingham, 125; at Cotton Hall, *ibid.*; ordained, 126; they join Oratory, 176 *seq.*, 237; edits *Lives of Modern Saints*, 243; attacked by Rev. E. Price and others, 245; letter to Newman, 246; series discontinued, 248; letter to Bishop Wareing, 249; Rev. E. Price apologises, 251; series resumed, 252; foundation of London Oratory, 254; imitation of Roman customs, 256; attitude towards non-Catholics, 258, 259, 262, 263.
Factory Act, ii. 49 *seq.*
Farm Street Church, ii. 28 *seq*, 259.

Farnham, Lord, ii. 141.
Fathers of Charity, i. 67 *seq.*, 137, 176; ii. 21.
Ferdinand, King, ii. 223.
Filippani, Cavalieri, ii. 231.
FitzAlan, Lord, ii. 37, 50, 51. See also Earl of Arundel and Surrey.
Fitzherbert, ii. 12.
Foley, Rev. William, ii. 16.
Fox, ii. 237.
Fransoni, Cardinal, i. 63, 65, 127, 134, 158, 159, 160, 171, 189, 212; ii. 29, 166, 214, 221.
Froude, Hurrell, ii. 83 *seq.*
Fryer, Mgr., i. 58.
Furlong, Rev. M., i. 30, 176; ii. 24, 25.

GABRIELI, Countess, ii. 173.
Gaeta, the Pope at, ii. 232.
Gainsborough, Earl of, ii. 129.
Gallini, Misses, i. 58, 59, 62. See also St. John's Wood.
Garibaldi, ii. 235.
Gavazzi, Padre, ii. 226.
Gentili, Rev. A., i. 33, 67, 68, 69, 135 *seq.*, 176, 216; ii. 19, 21, 22, 24, 26, 106.
George IV., i. 10; ii. 191.
Gerard, Sir John, ii. 35, 38.
Giffard, Bishop, ii. 172.
Gillis, Bishop, ii. 58, 185, 280.
Gioberti, Vincenzo, ii. 186.
Giustiniani, Cardinal, i. 10, 128.
Gladstone, W. E., i. 114; ii. 113, 203, 204.
Gladstone, Miss Lucy, i. 114.
Glover, Rev. E. (O.S.B.), i. 48.
Glover, Rev. T. (S.J.), i. 59.
Gordon, Rev. Joseph, ii. 126.
Gordon, Rev. Thomas, ii. 126.
Gothic Vestments, i. 115 *seq.*; ii. 14.
Gradwell, Bishop, i. 12, 51, 52, 187; ii. 172, 189.
Graham, Gillespie, ii. 264.
Graham, Sir James, ii. 49, 80.
Grant, Rev. Thomas, ii. 122, 125, 212, 213, 215, 221, 235, 281, 282, 283, 284.
Gregory XVI., elected Pope, i. 40; writes to the VV.AA., 63, 127, 149; letter to London clergy, 178; negotiations with Bishop Baines, 215 *seq.*; writes to VV.AA., 218; acts in Farm Street dispute, ii. 29 *seq.*; won over by Dr. Wiseman about Oxford conversions, 101; censures Dr. Griffiths, 102; receives Faber in audience, 123; death, 162, 167, 170, 171, 186, 187, 189.
Griffiths, Bishop, elected Coadjutor to Dr. Bramston, i. 52; his qualifications, 53 *seq.*; consecration, 56, 58, 59; not favourable to Dr. Wiseman, 72, 73; succeeds as Vicar Apostolic, 80, 81, 123; goes to Rome to discuss hierarchy proposals, 126; audience of Pope, 127, 128; favours hierarchy, 129; asks opinions of clergy, 130; draws up scheme, 131, 132, 135; on the decree in favour of Regulars, 143, 144; opposes the *Oeuvre*, 146, 147, 149, 153; withdraws opposition to the *Oeuvre*, 153; difference with Bishop Walsh, 155, 159, 160, 164; objects to Dr. Wiseman's action in Rome, 165; V.A. of new London District, 166; his work in his diocese, 168 *seq.*; for the Colleges 173 *seq.*; missions opened or developed, 177 *seq.*; convents established, 180 *seq.*; on church music, 184; action as to Blundell Legacy, 187 *seq.*; action as to Marriage Act, 194; attitude to Spencer's prayers for Conversion of England, 210; letter to Dr. Gentili, ii. 27; opposes building of Farm Street Church, 28; journeys to Rome, 29; compromise as to Farm Street, *ibid.*; returns to England, 30, 43; letter to Lucas about *Tablet*, 47, 58; letter to Lord Stanhope about Father Mathew, 60, 61, 62, 78; letter for Prince Hohenlohe as to Oxford Movement, 96 *seq.*; incurs displeasure of the Pope, 101; his forecast criticised, 103; but proved correct, 104, 120, 150; illness, 159; his last letter, 164; death and funeral, 167 *seq.*, 173, 177, 260, 275.
Grisi, Madame, i. 184.

HAMILTON, M., ii. 165.
Hampden, Dr., ii. 87.
Handsworth, i. 99; ii. 199.
Harcourt, Duc d', ii. 231, 232.
Harding, St. Stephen, i. 106.
Hardman, John, i. 110; ii. 13.
Hearne, Rev. J., i. 73, 180.
Hearne, Rev. D., ii. 165, 211.
Hedley, Bishop, ii. 292.
Hendren, Bishop, ii. 216, 219, 282.
Heneage, Rev. H., ii. 125.
Hierurgia, i. 103, 104.
Hogarth, Bishop, ii. 282, 292.
Hohenlohe, Prince, ii. 96.
Holdstock, Rev. J., i. 5.
Howard, Mr. (of Corby), i. 3.

Howard, P., i. 198; ii. 37, 201.
Huddleston, Mr., ii. 201.
Hunt, Rev. William, ii. 169.
Husenbeth, Rev. F. C., i. 75; ii. 65, 112.
Hutchison, Rev. William, ii. 125.
Hutton, Rev. Peter, i. 30, 176.

Ideal of a Christian Church, ii. 109 *seq.*
Innis, Mr., ii. 40.
Ivers, Rev. Hardinge, ii. 174.

Jauch, Rev. J., ii. 61, 96.
Jenkins, Rev. Jerome, i. 44; ii. 56.
Jerningham, Stafford, ii. 64, 201.
Jerningham, Sir William, i. 82.
Jones, Rev. John, i. 53.
Jones, Mr. (of Llanarth), i. 198.
Jowett, Professor, ii. 113.

Keasley, Messrs, ii. 32, 39.
Keble, Dr., ii. 85.
Kenny, Dr., ii. 181.
Keogh, Rev. Edward, ii. 257.
Kirk, Rev. John, i. 74, 195, 197; ii. 4, 12, 89.
Knill, John, ii. 183.
Knill, Sir Stuart, ii. 129.

Laing, Rev. Francis, ii. 127.
Lambruschini, Cardinal, ii. 186, 187.
Lancaster, Joseph, ii. 146, 147.
Langdale, Hon. Charles, i. 5, 195, 197; ii. 1, 37, 51, 53, 75, 80, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 157.
Lansdowne, Lord, ii. 149.
Lanzo, i. 183.
Lawson, Mr., i. 198.
Leigh, William, ii. 178.
Leo XII., i. 32; ii. 189.
Leslie, Rev. Eric, ii. 129.
Lewis, David, ii. 126, 253.
Leyburn, Bishop, ii. 172.
Life of Wiseman, quoted, ii. 2, 3, 30, 180, 208, 242, 286.
Lincoln's Inn Fields, Church at, i. 71, 73, 77, 147, 183, 184; ii. 26.
Lingard, Rev. John, i. 54, 55; drafts letter of VV.AA. to Pope, 62, 75, 158, 159; on church music, 185; on English hymns, 186; pamphlet on Royal Declaration, 199, 200; ii. 5, 6; in favour of Diplomatic Relations, 201; low opinion of converts' scholarship, 237, 242.
Littlemore, ii. 91, 114, 118, 121.
Lives of Modern Saints (Oratorian), ii. 243 *seq.*
Lives of English Saints (Tractarian), ii. 91.
Lockhart, Rev. William, ii. 91, 106.
Logan, Rev. H. C., i. 31, 176, 203; ii. 7, 117.
London, Bishop of, ii. 76, 118.
London Clergy, letter to Pope, i. 160.
Louis Philippe, ii. 223.
Lovat, Lord, i. 198.
Lowther Rooms, ii. 274.
Lucas, Frederick, conversion by Anstey, i. 77, 78, 198, 203; ii. 1; offered editorship of *Tablet*, 31; his manner of writing, 32 *seq.*; political opinions, 34; difference with O'Connell, 37; crisis in *Tablet*, 39; establishes *True Tablet*, 41; difference with Wiseman, 43; failure of original *Tablet*, 46; survival of Lucas's *Tablet*, *ibid.*; visits Ireland and converted to repeal, 47; Dr. Griffiths complains of his writings, *ibid.*; Lucas protests against Education Clauses in Factory Bill, 50; on the Catholic Institute, 54; on the meaning of Fr. Mathew's "Pledge," 67 *seq.*; on the Penal Laws, 74, 76, 77; attacks the Irish Bishops, 78; criticises Wiseman's attitude to Tractarians, 108, 109, 120; on the Irish Famine, 134; on the Government's Education policy, 151; attacks Langdale, 153; apologises, 154; founds association of St. Thomas, 155, 158; falls out with Anstey, 163; obituary article on Dr. Griffiths, 170; falls out with Dr. Wiseman, 174; organises meeting against Diplomatic Relations Bill, 193; draws out memorial against it for signature, 195; retires to Dublin with the *Tablet*, 204.
Lulworth, i. 106.
Lyndhurst, Lord, ii. 80.
Lyons, Lord, ii. 129.
Lythgoe, Rev. R., i. 77, 146; ii. 30, 31.

Macaulay, Miss Catherine, i. 181.
McDermott, Rev. Michael, ii. 141, 143.
McDonnell, Rev. T., i. 74, 110; ii. 10, 11, 15, 16, 174, 211, 212, 216.
McHale, Archbishop, ii. 136; letter to Lord John Russell, 137 *seq.*; second ditto, 139 *seq.*, 144, 195, 209.
McMullen, Rev. R. G., ii. 113, 127.
Maguire, Rev. J., ii. 171.
Mahon, Major, ii. 141, 143.
Mahony, Countess, i. 10.
Mahony, Rev. Francis ("Father Prout"), ii. 243.

Mai, Cardinal, i. 59, 124, 125, 127, 148; ii. 214.
Mamiani, Count, ii. 226 *seq.*
Manning, Rev. H. E., i. 64, 170, 192, 193; ii. 113, 127, 201, 225, 226, 227, 290, 293.
Marriage Act, i. 191.
Marsh, Rev. R., i. 23, 48.
Maryvale, ii. 177, 178. See also Oscott.
Mathew, Rev. Theobald, ii. 59; invited by Lord Stanhope, 60; arrives and visits York, 62; plan of action, *ibid.*; visits northern towns, 63; arrives in London, *ibid.*; goes to Norwich at invitation of Anglican Bishop, 64; thence to Birmingham, 66; returns to Ireland, *ibid.*; discussion in press, 67 *seq.*; on meaning of pledge, 68 *seq.*
Maxwell, Mr., ii. 201.
Maynooth, ii. 241.
Mazzini, ii. 186, 235.
Melia, Rev. R., ii. 209, 210.
Metcalfe, Rev. E. P., i. 28, 30, 31, 48.
Metternich, ii. 186, 225.
Mezzofanti, Cardinal, i. 71.
Miley, Dr., ii. 243.
Mills, Rev. H. A., ii. 125.
Milner, Bishop, i. 74, 82, 101, 193; ii. 105, 237.
Minto, Lord, ii. 190, 191, 206, 223, 285.
Monsell, William, see Emly, Lord.
Montgomery, G., ii. 118.
Moore, Rev. J., ii. 124, 125.
Moore, Thomas, ii. 242.
Moorfields Church, i. 73, 80; ii. 55, 171.
Morgan, Augustus de, i. 58.
Morning Chronicle, ii. 135.
Morning Herald, ii. 67.
Morris, Bishop, i. 58; ii. 58, 156.
Morris, Rev. John, ii. 127, 128.
Morris, J. Brande, ii. 126.
Mostyn, Bishop, ii. 7, 145.
Mostyn, Sir P., ii. 201.
Mount Melleray, i. 105, 106.
Mount St. Bernard's, i. 105, 109; ii. 19, 126, 128.
Murray, Archbishop, i. 181; ii. 78.
Myers, Mr., i. 92.

Nash, John, i. 83.
Neville, Rev. William, ii. 127.
Newman, J. H., visits Wiseman in Rome, i. 65, 139; Vicar of St. Mary's, ii. 83; tour with H. Froude, 84, 85, 87, 88; writes Tract XC., 90; retires to Littlemore, 91, 103, 107, 113; reception into Church, 115; views of old Catholics thereon, 115, 117; Confirmation at Oscott, 119; tour through England, 120; moves to Maryvale (Old Oscott), 121; goes to Rome, 126, 127; Ordination and return, 175; receives Faber's community at Maryvale, 176; Oratory inaugurated, 177, 237; question of Oratorian Saints' Lives, 243 *seq.*; letter to Faber, 248; to Ullathorne, complaining of his action, 250; Oratory fixed at Birmingham, 252; Views on Gothic Architecture, 255 *seq.*; attitude towards non-Catholics, 258, 262; admiration of Wiseman, 286; preaches the "Second Spring," 290.
Newsham, Mgr. Charles, i. 140, 141, 142, 174; ii. 7, 120, 180.
Newsham, Rev. R., ii. 118.
Nicholson, Archbishop, ii. 220, 221, 231.
Norfolk, Dukes of, i. 3; ii. 129, 157, 258, 286.
Norfolk, Duchess of, ii. 129, 258.
Norris, Rev. Edward, i. 67, 147.
Northcote, Rev. J. S., ii. 113, 121, 239.
Nottingham, St. Barnabas's, i. 119; ii. 10, 199, 234.

Oakeley, Rev. Frederick, ii. 87, 88 *seq.*, 103, 107, 118, 119, 194, 240.
O'Connell, Daniel, i. 75, 76, 197, 198; ii. 8, 37, 38, 39, 42, 43, 52, 53, 54, 76.
"Oeuvre" for Propagation of Faith, i. 146, 147, 151 *seq.*; ii. 260.
Oliver, Rev. G., ii. 243.
Old Hall, St. Edmund's College, i. 15, 54, 80, 90, 148, 173 *seq.*, 179, 192, 200; ii. 239, 240, 242, 275.
O'Neal, Rev. J., ii. 194.
Orioli, Cardinal, ii. 214.
Orthodox Journal, i. 74, 114, 122, 183; ii. 3, 31, 92, 119, 179.
Oscott College, i. 15, 110, 111, 114, 115, 166, 173, 174, 175, 207, 217; ii. 3 *seq.*, 22, 23, 117, 118, 124, 126, 233, 239, 290, 293.
Ostini, Cardinal, ii. 214.
Oudinot, General, ii. 235.
Oxford Herald, ii. 113, 114, 179.

Pagani, Rev. J. B., i. 137, 138.
Paley, W. A., ii. 128.
Palma, Mgr., ii. 212, 230, 281, 283.
Palmer, Father Bernard, i. 108.
Palmer, William, ii. 83, 108, 109.
Palmerston, Lord, ii. 64, 188, 191, 202, 234.

Pantaleoni, Dr., ii. 227, 229.
Parker, Rev. Joseph, ii. 196.
Passionists, ii. 22, 255.
Patterson, Rev. J. L., ii. 127.
Peach, Rev. Edward, i. 110.
Pedecini, Cardinal, i. 61, 63.
Peel, Sir Robert, i. 191; ii. 37, 75, 133, 148, 151.
Penny, Rev. W. G., ii. 175.
Penswick, Bishop, i. 11, 56, 62, 123, 125.
Petre, Bishop, ii. 172.
Petre, Edward, i. 5; ii. 37, 75, 183.
Petre, Lord, ii. 75.
Phillipps, Ambrose Lisle, i. 33, 67; friend of Pugin, 104; hopes for conversion of England, 105; establishes Cistercian Monastery in Charnwood Forest, 105 *seq.*, 116, 117, 163; joins movement of Spencer for Prayers for Conversion of England, 204; low opinion of old Catholics, 211; ii. 34, 106, 128, 158, 201, 243; reproaches Faber, 254; opposes him on Gothic Architecture, 255; high opinion of Anglicans, 258, 259, 263.
Pius VIII., i. 10, 43.
Pius IX., ii. 82; elected Pope, 162, 163; decides to restore English Hierarchy, 166, 171, 175, 179; political state of Rome during his Pontificate, 186 *seq.*; attempts to renew diplomatic relations with England, 190, 203, 212, 214, 217, 218, 224, 225, 226, 230 *seq.*, 283, 284.
Plowden, Rev. Robert, i. 44.
Polding, Archbishop, i. 39, 145; ii. 14, 161.
Pontigny, i. 106, 107.
Portuguese Chapel, ii. 28, 30.
Potter, Mr., i. 111.
Powell, John, i. 92, 101.
Poynter, Bishop, i. 58, 80, 133, 146, 180.
Premord, Abbé, i. 42, 43.
Price, Rev. Edward, ii. 246, 250, 251.
Prior Park, i. 14, 25, 31, 40, 65, 67 *seq.*, 78, 137, 150, 165, 174 *seq.*, 190; ii. 55, 57, 58, 120, 121, 211, 239.
Pugin, Augustus (elder) i. 83.
Pugin, Augustus Welby, i. 82; early life, 83; prepares drawings for furniture at Windsor, *ibid.*; unsuccessful attempt at theatre scene designing, 84; first marriage, *ibid.*; death of wife and second marriage, 85; lives at Salisbury, *ibid.*; account of his own conversion, 85 *seq.*; writes *Contrasts*, 87 *seq.*; moves to Chelsea, then Ramsgate, 91; his work and principles, 92 *seq.*; views about rood-screens, 97, 101; friendship with Earl of Shrewsbury, 102, and with Daniel Rock, 104, and with Lisle Phillipps, *ibid.*; plans Mount St. Bernard's Monastery, 109; work at Oscott, 111; Professor of Ecclesiastical Art there, 113; opening of his first churches St. Mary's Uttoxeter and Derby, 114 *seq.*; conversion of second wife, 119 *seq.*; designs chapels at Ushaw and St. Edmund's, 174; on legacy system, 190; ii. 1, 8, 10; designs St. Chad's, Birmingham, 11; opening ceremonies, 13 *seq.*, 125; designs St. George's, Southwark, 182 *seq.*, 234; differences with Oratorians, 255 *seq.*, 263; his share in new Houses of Parliament, 264; visit to Rome, 265; marries third time, 266; letter in *Tablet* on Rood Screen controversy, 269 *seq.*, 272, 273; protests against Lowther Rooms converted into new Oratory, 274; *Remarks on Articles in Rambler*, *ibid.*; disappointment with his own work, 275; *Treatise on Rood Screens*, 276 *seq.*; enthusiasm at new hierarchy, 289; illness and death, *ibid.*
Purbrick, Rev. Edward, ii. 259.
Purcell, E. S., i. 190.
Pusey, Rev. E. B., ii. 86, 112, 120.

Quiblier, Abbé, ii. 281.
Quin, Michael, i. 75; ii. 42.

Radetzky, General, ii. 225.
Rambler, i. 13; ii. 121, 192, 238, 239, 241, 245, 274, 284.
Ratcliffe College, ii. 239.
Redemptorists, ii. 24, 179, 180.
Regula Missionis. See *Apostolicum Ministerium.*
Reithmuller, ii. 40.
Rey, Rev. A., i. 68.
Riddell, Bishop, ii. 145, 211.
Robinson, Rev. T. G., i. 48.
Rock, Rev. Daniel, i. 103, 119 *seq.*; ii. 159, 242, 289.
Rolfe, Rev. John, ii. 169.
Roman Gazette, ii. 175.
Romilly, Lord, ii. 163.
Rooker, Rev. T., i. 28, 31, 48.
Roothaam, Father, ii. 29.
Rosmini, Abbate, i. 68, 137; ii. 21.
Rossi, Pellegrino, ii. 228, 229.
Rowe, Rev. J. B., ii. 127.

Russell, Lord John, ii. 80, 81, 133 *seq.*, 137, 148, 150, 151, 190.
Russell, Watts, ii. 176.
Ryder, Rev. George Dudley, ii. 126.
Ryder, Rev. Ignatius Dudley, ii. 126.

Saffi, ii. 235.
St. Edmund, i. 106, 107.
St. Edmund's College. See Old Hall.
St. John, Rev. Ambrose, ii. 91, 115.
St. John's Wood, church at, i. 58 *seq.*, 80, 128. See also Gallini, Misses.
Salford, St. John's, ii. 219.
Scott, Bishop, i. 45, 48.
Scrope, Mr., ii. 201.
Sedgley Park, i. 159.
Sharples, Bishop, i. 164 *seq.*, 173, 205, 206.
Sheehan, Rev. J., ii. 16.
Shepherd, Mgr., i. 32.
Shiel, R. Lalor, ii. 243.
Shrewsbury, Earl of. See Talbot, John.
Shuttleworth, W. Kay, ii. 149, 151.
Sibthorpe, Rev. R. Waldo, ii. 105, 106.
Simeon, Sir John, ii. 129.
Simpson, Rev. Richard, ii. 121.
Sisk, Rev. T., i. 197.
Slater, Bishop, i. 19.
Smith, Bishop, i. 11, 29.
Smith, Rev. Bernard, ii. 3, 107, 118.
Smith, James, i. 76.
Smith, Mrs. Campbell, ii. 117.
Soglia, Cardinal, ii. 228.
Southwark, St. George's Cathedral, i. 57, 118, 178; ii. 182 *seq.*, 219, 221, 266, 270, 275.
Spain, Rev. L., i. 21.
Spaur, Count, ii. 229, 232.
Spencer, Rev. George Ignatius, i. 109; organises prayers for conversion of England, 203 *seq.*; at Oscott, ii. 1, 7, 17, 22, 65, 66, 117; joins Passionists, 178.
Stafford, Lord, i. 198.
Stanhope, Lord, ii. 60, 61, 62, 64.
Stanley, Dr., Bishop of Norwich, ii. 65, 113, 127.
Stanton, Rev. R., ii. 91, 115, 119, 175, 176.
Stapleton, C., i. 58, 198.
Statuta Proposita, i., 144, 145, 147, 149, 158, 159, 160.
Statuta Provisoria, i. 132, 134, 144, 145.
Stonor, Edmund (afterwards Archbishop), ii. 185.
Stonyhurst, ii. 18, 28, 220, 242.
Stourton, Lord, i. 197, 198; ii. 75.
Surrey, Earl of. See Arundel and Surrey, Earl of.

Tablet, ii. 2, 3, 25, 32, 35, 37 *seq.*, 68, 70, 71, 80, 108, 114, 134, 136, 137, 143, 144, 152, 153, 159, 163, 167, 168, 170, 174, 175, 179, 188, 191, 193, 195, 204, 209, 240, 269, 289.
Tablet, True, ii. 40, 41, 44, 45, 46.
Talbot, John, sixteenth Earl of Shrewsbury, i. 5; patron of Pugin, 102, 103, 104, 107; helps to establish Mount St. Bernard's Abbey, 109; benefactor of St. Marie's, Derby, 115 *seq.*, 119; finds fault with VV. AA., 130; in favour of the *Oeuvre*, 146; becomes President, 153, 176; President of Catholic Institute, 196, 209; benefactor of St. Chad's, Birmingham, ii. 11, 15; criticised by Lucas, 33; a Whig in politics, 34, 42, 43; Wiseman's Letter to, 97 *seq.*, 103; invites Wilfridians to Cotton Hall, 125, 129; Letter to Bishop Browne, 141; to Archbishop McHale on the Irish clergy, 141, 144, 158, 175; benefactor to St. George's, Southwark, 183; Wiseman's panegyric of, 198 *seq.*, 254.
Tait, Archbishop, ii. 113.
Talbot, Bertram, ii. 129.
Talbot, Bishop James, ii. 172.
Talbot, Rev. George, ii. 118, 179.
Tempest, Mr. (of Broughton), i. 198; ii. 165.
Thompson, Rev. W., ii. 6, 7.
Thompson, Edward Healy, ii. 127.
Tickell, Rev. George, ii. 126, 259.
Tierney, Rev. Mark, i. 13, 75, 129; ii. 174, 243, 289.
Times, ii. 68, 113, 136, 169, 185.
Toovey, James, ii. 126.
Towneley, C., i. 198; ii. 35, 37.
Tracts for the Times, i. 66; ii. 86, 95, 108; Tract XC., 112, 116.
Trappes, Rev. F., ii. 165, 211.
Trelawny, Rev. Sir Henry, i. 67.
Trenow, Rev. F. W., ii. 127.
Tuite, Rev. Francis, i. 147.
Turner, Bishop, ii. 282.
Turner, Rev. J., i. 39.

Ullathorne, Bishop, on saintliness of Earl of Shrewsbury, i. 103, 132, 137; on Dr. Gentili, 139, 145, 169; ii. 5, 19; early life, 160; letter on accepting Bishopric of Western District, 161, 164; his opinion of Dr. Griffiths, 167, 171; opposed to Diplomatic Relations, 193, 196, 201, 210, 211; deputed to Rome about Hierarchy, 212 *seq.*; letter to Wiseman, 213; draws out

scheme for twelve dioceses, 215; appointed V.A. of Central District, 216; writes to Wiseman announcing acceptance of his scheme as to Hierarchy, 217; returns to meet Bishops at opening of St. John's, Salford, 218, 227, 228; writes on Catholic Education, 240, 245; letter to Newman on Oratorian Saints' Lives, 246 *seq.*; letter to *Tablet* about the same, 250; further letter to Newman, 251, 252, 254, 262, 279, 280; writes to Rome urging Wiseman as first Archbishop, 281, 282, 285, 287, 290, 292; last survivor of Vicars Apostolic, 293.
Univers, ii. 107, 284.
Ushaw, St. Cuthbert's College, i. 15, 65, 123, 173, 174; ii. 8, 120, 129, 219, 239, 242.
Ushaw Magazine, ii. 7.
Uttoxeter, St. Mary's, ii. 14.

VAUGHAN, Herbert (Cardinal), i. 170; ii. 185, 292.
Vavasour, Sir E., i. 71.
Vespasiani, Mgr., ii. 281, 283.
Veto, the, ii. 77.
Victor Emmanuel II., ii. 234.
Victoria, Queen, accession, i. 198; on "Papal Aggression," ii. 287.
Vizzardelli, Cardinal, ii. 214.

WACKERBATH, Rev. A., ii. 21.
Walker, Rev. John, ii. 119, 126.
Walmesley, Bishop, i. 201; ii. 37.
Walsh, Bishop, V.A. of Midland District, i. 11; letter to Benedictines, 27; one of the Arbitrators on Baines case, 45, 48, 49, 56, 105, 108, 109; at opening of new Oscott, 112, 116, 117, 118, 123, 125; visits Rome, 126; audience of Pope, 127, 132, 144; supports the *Oeuvre*, 146, 152, 153, 155, 156, 157; appointed V.A. of New Central District, 166; joins in pastoral on Colleges, 173, 175; action as to Blundell Legacy, 188 *seq.*, 205; encourages Rev. G. Spencer, 207; ii. 3, 4, 9; determines to build St. Chad's Cathedral, 10; inspects newly found relics of St. Chad, 12; opening of St. Chad's, 13 *seq.*; differences with Rev. T. McDonnell, 16, 22, 23; procrastinates on Education question, 149, 171; suggested as new Archbishop, 207 *seq.*; begs to remain in Birmingham, 209, 215; appointed Archbishop of Westminster, 216; moves to London as V.A. in preparation for Archiepiscopate, 219, 220; death, 233, 243, 253, 279, 281.
Ward, W. G., ii. 87, 103, 106, 114, 117, 120, 194, 236, 237, 258, 267, 268.
Ward, Mrs., ii. 114, 117.
Wareing, Bishop, i. 166; ii. 3, 4, 128, 247, 249, 292.
Warwick Street Chapel, music at, i. 183; ii. 29.
Waters, Rev. Placid, i. 23.
Waterton, Charles, ii. 242, 243.
Watson, Mr., ii. 79, 81.
Weathers, Rev. W., ii. 201, 202.
Webbe, Samuel, i. 186.
Weedall, Rev. Henry, i. 75, 147, 160, 166; ii. 4, 5.
Weld, Cardinal, i. 14, 41, 43, 46, 56, 59, 63; death, 126; ii. 189.
Weld, Charles, i. 5, 76, 146, 151, 197, 208.
Weld, Thomas, i. 106.
Weld, Mr., of Lulworth, i. 198.
Weld, Mr., of Chideock, i. 76.
Wellesley, Marquis, i. 1.
Wellington, Duke of, i. 10, 127; ii. 37, 64, 192.
Wenham, Rev. J. G., ii. 126.
Whateley, Dr., i. 66.
Wheble, Mr., i. 198.
Whitaker, Rev. M., i. 209.
Wilberforce, Henry, ii. 127.
Wilds, Rev. W., ii. 160.
Wilfridians, ii. 125, 176.
William IV., i. 10.
Wilkinson, Rev. Thomas, ii. 129.
Wingfield, Rev. W., ii. 126.
Wiseman, Bishop, i. 12, 13; life in Rome, 14; suggests compromise by Sanatio on case between Bishop Baines and the Benedictines, 30; Baines's scheme for Catholic University, 31; attempts mediation in Benedictine case, 41; dangerous accident, *ibid.*, 43; Baines's application to have him as Coadjutor refused, 45, 51, 59, 64; visit to England, 65; views on Oxford Movement, 66; visit to Prior Park, 67; falls out with Baines, 69; travels through England, 70; Lecture at Lincoln's Inn Church, 71, 72; lectures at Moorfields, 73; founds *Dublin Review*, 74 *seq.*, 78, 79, 80, 81, 123; letter to Dr. Griffiths on Hierarchy, 124 *seq.*, 126, 127; letter on misunderstandings at Rome, 135 *seq.*; plans with Dr. Newsham

for coming to England as a missionary, 141 *seq.*; letters on English affairs in Rome, 148, 149, 151; blamed by Dr. Baines, 156; scheme for sending Passionists to England, 163 *seq.*; he is unpopular with English Clergy, 165; appointed President of Oscott and Coadjutor V.A., 166; consecrated Bishop, 167, 168, 169, 171, 174; on Prayers for the Queen, 201; letter to Rev. G. Spencer encouraging him, 207; prayers for conversion of England, 209 *seq.*, 217; ii. 1; arrives at Oscott as President, 3; letter to Lingard, 5, 6, 7; his work at Oscott, 8 *seq.*; St. Chad's Cathedral, 11 *seq.*; difference with Rev. T. McDonnell, 15 *seq.*, 21; receives Father Dominic, 22 *seq.*, 29; letter to Lucas on the *True Tablet*, 43; receives Father Mathew at Birmingham, 65; letter to *Times* on meaning of Pledge, 68, 84; article on Donatists, 88, 89, 91; articles on Tractarians, 95; letter to Earl of Shrewsbury on Re-union, 97 *seq.*, 103; receives Sibthorpe, 105, 106, 108, 109; confirms Newman and others at Oscott, 117 *seq.*, 120, 121, 122; compromised by Earl of Shrewsbury's Letter on Irish Clergy, 144; agitates on Education, 152, 160; deputed to Rome to plead for Hierarchy, 163; his report, 164; draws up petition, 166; sent back to England on Diplomatic mission, 167, 171; Pro-Vicar of London District, 173; mixed reception, 174; disclaims connection with *Tablet*, 175, 176, 177; establishes Passionists in London, 178; and Redemptorists, 179; other diocesan work, 180 *seq.*; opens St. George's Cathedral, 184 *seq.*, 189, 195; writes *Words of Peace* to counteract Lucas's meeting, 196; draws out counter petition for signature, 201, 204, 205; the most suitable candidate for Archbishopric but too young, 207, 208; proposed by Barnabò as Coadjutor to Dr. Walsh in London, 209, 212, 213, 215, 216, 217; to be Coadjutor to Archbishop, 218, 219; influences against him in Rome, 220 *seq.*; his difficulty about St. George's, 221; assists at death of Bishop Walsh, 233, 234, 236, 242; approves of Faber's Saints' Lives, 243; urges Rev. E. Price to apologise for his attack, 251; having become V.A. London District, approves of foundation of London Oratory, 253 *seq.*; Institution of Forty Hours' Exposition, 268; created Cardinal, 279; arriving at Rome learns that he is to return as Cardinal Archbishop, 281; Pastoral from Flaminian Gate announcing Hierarchy, 283; heads deputation to thank Pope, 284; his pastoral one cause of Papal Aggression agitation, 285; made up by his extraordinary vigour in meeting it, 286; *Appeal to English People*, *ibid.*, 287; presides and preaches at first Provincial Synod, 290; the preparation of the Decree his masterpiece, 291, 292.

Wolsey, Sir Charles, i. 217.

Woolfrey, Dom Norbert, i. 105, 106.

Woolfrey, Dom Odilo, i. 108.

Wyatt, Mr., i. 85.

Wyse, Mr., ii. 243.

Youens, Rev. T., i. 7, 45, *seq.*, 147.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, ABERDEEN

274.208
W21

3417

WARD, BERNARD

AUTHOR

The Sequel to the Catholic Emancipation. Vol. I.

TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER

3417